3 0513 40041 5903

G ROOM

Accession Number Shelf Number

[redacted]

[redacted] THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ΧΑΡΙΣ

EPHESIANS 2·8-10

MCMXXXVII

From [redacted]

Received [redacted]

[redacted] OR REFERENCE

BE TAKEN FROM THIS RO

Denver Seminary Washington DC Extensio
c/o First Baptist Church of Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414

BRARY

Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/theocratickingdo0003pete_c3f8

THE THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

of our

LORD JESUS, THE CHRIST,

as covenanted in

THE OLD TESTAMENT

and presented in

THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

GEORGE N. H. PETERS, A.M.

Preface by

WILBUR M. SMITH, D.D.

COMPLETE IN THREE VOLUMES

VOL. III

KREGEL PUBLICATIONS
Grand Rapids 6, Michigan
1952

RV
P481
1952
v.3

L.C. No. 40-20165

BT
94
.P4
Vol. 3

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THIS VOLUME

IS

Respectfully Dedicated

TO

W. H. CONLEY, Esq.,

AND

Dr. J. T. McLAUGHLIN,

*To whom the author is deeply indebted for sympathy and pecuniary aid in the prosecution and publication of the work.**

The divine assurances (as e.g. Prov. 11:25; 19:17; *Matt.* 5:7; *Isa.* 32:8; *Matt.* 10:42, *etc.) of an ultimate repayment given by God Himself, indicates* THE COGNIZANCE OF ONE *abundantly able to fulfil His promises. May an ample realization of His faithfulness be their happy experience. Faith in the same "blessed Hope," in the same Theocratic Kingdom, influenced them to give their needed assistance, and, therefore, it is but proper for me to express, in this form, the desire and prayer, that the mighty Theocratic King—whom they thus honored—may honor them in His Coming Kingdom.*

THE AUTHOR.

**The author likewise acknowledges his deep indebtedness to Hon. J. W. Bookwalter; S. A. Bowman, Esq.; Ed. P. Christie; Augustus Kountze, Esq.; A. D. Jones, Esq.; P. Schindler, Esq., and others, for aid and sympathy extended. A sense of gratitude prompts this brief, but* DESERVED, *mention.*

"And as it is decreed that the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so if it ever comes to be understood before the restitution of all things, and without miraculous interventions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at, by the continuance and progress of learning and liberty, and by particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down, which are overlooked and disregarded by the majority of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made by thoughtful men, tracing on obscure hints, as it were, dropped to us by nature accidentally, or what seems to come into our minds by chance. Nor is it incredible that a book which has been so long in possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered, for all the phenomena and the same faculties of investigation from which such great discoveries have been made in the present and the past age were equally in possession of mankind several thousand years before. And possibly it might be intended that events as they come to pass should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture."—BUTLER'S *Analogy*, Part II., Ch. 3.

CYPRIAN, PREF. TO TESTIMONIA: "More strength will be imparted to thee, and the eyes of thine understanding will continually grow clearer, if thou searchest more carefully through the Old and New Test., and diligently perusest all parts of the Holy Scriptures; for I have only drawn a little out of the divine fountain to send thee in the meantime. Thou canst drink more copiously and satisfy thyself, when, with us, thou also approachest to the same fountain of divine fulness, in order to drink after the same manner."—Quoted by Dr. NEANDER, *Genl. Ch. His.*, Vol. 2, p. 447.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PROP. 165.—The doctrine of this Kingdom enables us to form a correct estimate of human governments 11

PROP. 166.—The rudimentary reorganization of the Kingdom will be made at Mount Sinai 17

PROP. 167.—The re-establishment of this Kingdom embraces also the reception of a New Revelation of the Divine Will 29

PROP. 168.—This Kingdom has its place of manifested royalty 32

PROP. 169.—The Theocratic Kingdom includes the marriage of Christ to the New Jerusalem 39

PROP. 170.—This doctrine of the Kingdom fully sustained by "the Father's house" of John 14 : 2 53

PROP. 171.—This Kingdom is connected with the Baptism of the Holy Ghost (Spirit) and of Fire 64

PROP. 172.—This Kingdom, when restored, does not require the re-introduction of bloody sacrifices 83

PROP. 173.—The Kingdom of the Lord Jesus may be near at hand 92

PROP. 174.—This Kingdom of the Messiah is preceded by, and connected with, signs 109

PROP. 175.—The doctrine of the Kingdom is greatly obscured and perverted by the prevailing one of the conversion of the world prior to the Advent of Jesus 171

PROP. 176.—Our doctrine of the Kingdom embraces the conversion of the world, but in the Scriptural order 210

PROP. 177.—This doctrine of the Kingdom will not be received in faith by the Church, as a body 217

PROP. 178.—This doctrine of the Kingdom, and its essentially related subjects, are so hostile to their faith, that numerous organized religious bodies totally reject them 248

PROP. 179.—The doctrine of the Kingdom, or essentials of the same, are directly allied by various bodies with doctrines that are objectionable, and hence are made unpalatable to many 260

PROP. 180.—This doctrine of the Kingdom will not be received in faith by the world 278

PROP. 181.—Our doctrinal position illustrated and enforced by the Parable of the Ten Virgins 299

PROP. 182.—This Kingdom embraces "the One Hope" 309

PROP. 183.—The doctrine of the Kingdom, and its related subjects, have a direct practical tendency 320

PROP. 184.—In this Kingdom will be exhibited a manifested unity 335

PROP. 185.—This doctrine enforces that of Divine Providence 340

PROP. 186.—This doctrine of the Kingdom sustained by the Analogy of Scripture, the Analogy of Faith, and the Analogy of Tradition 343

PROP. 187.—This doctrine of the Kingdom gives coherency to the Gospels, and indicates the unity of design in each of them 349

PROP. 188.—This doctrine indicates the unity of the Epistles 361

PROP. 189.—It is only through this doctrine of the Kingdom that the Apocalypse can, or will, be understood and consistently interpreted 366

PROP. 190.—Our views sustained by the addresses to the Seven Churches 377

PROP. 191.—Our doctrine enforced by the general tenor of the Apocalypse 382

PROP. 192.—This doctrine of the Kingdom greatly serves to explain Scripture 388

PROP. 193.—This doctrine of the Kingdom meets, and consistently removes, the objections brought by the Jews against Christianity 408

PROP. 194.—This doctrine of the Kingdom materially aids to explain the world's history 427

PROP. 195.—This doctrine of the Kingdom may, analogically, give us a clew to the government of other worlds 443

PROP. 196.—This doctrine of the Kingdom gives us a more comprehensive view of the work of Christ for Redemptive purposes 449

PROP. 197.—This Kingdom, although visible with a world-dominion, being Theocratic, is also necessarily spiritual 460

PROP. 198.—The doctrine of the Kingdom confirms the credibility and inspiration of the Word of God 467

PROP. 199.—This doctrine of the Kingdom materially aids in deciding the great Christological question of the day 512

PROP. 200.—While the Kingdom is given to Jesus Christ as "the Son of Man," He becomes thereby the actual Representative of God, manifesting God in the person of One related to humanity 537

PROP. 201.—If a Kingdom such as is covenanted to "the Son of Man," David's Son, is not set up, then God's effort at government, in and through an earthly rulership, proves a failure 544

PROP. 202.—If the Kingdom of "the Son of Man," as covenanted, is not established, then the earth will lack in its history the exhibition of a perfect government 548

PROP. 203.—The exaltation of the Christ is not lessened or lowered by thus referring the promises of the Kingdom to an outward manifestation in the future 552

PROP. 204.—Such a view gives definiteness and a continued exaltation to the human nature of Christ, and indicates the majestic relationship that it sustains throughout the ages to the race of man..... 557

PROP. 205.—The doctrine of the Kingdom materially aids us in preaching "the Christ," the distinctive "Messiah"..... 567

PROP. 206.—This earth will yet witness the re-establishment of a glorious Theocracy —a Theocracy in its perfected form..... 582

CONCLUSION 603

THE

THEOCRATIC KINGDOM

OF OUR

LORD JESUS THE CHRIST.

PROPOSITION 165. *The doctrine of this Kingdom enables us to form a correct estimate of human governments.*

This already appears from the contemplated cessation of all Gentile domination, the complete overthrow of all kingdoms and states, and the bringing of all nations directly (by the rule of the saints, etc.) under the one great central Theocratic authority. For, whatever purposes the institution of human government, in the past and the present dispensation, may subserve, it is distinctly announced that so much of imperfection and evil is attached to it in all its varied forms that it is *incompatible* with the new order of things which shall be presented in "the age to come."

Obs. 1. In the consideration of this subject men have been apt to rush to extremes, presenting conclusions which are not warranted by Scripture. One party lauds and magnifies human government, as it has existed and now exists, as *a Divine* institution, speaking loudly of "the divine rights of kings," or of "the sovereignty of the people," etc.—so numerous writers of the past and present. Another party, only regarding the threats, etc., against such government, and misapprehending the time, manner, etc., of God's kingdom to replace it, undertake to break down such government by substituting one of their own; so the Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy Men, in the days of the Reformation, the Mormons, etc. Still another party so decry all human government, that they insist upon it, that it is the duty of believers to avoid having any personal connection with them in any official capacity, or in upholding them in any form as a participator; so e.g. Quakers, Christadelphians, some Adventists, Seventh Day Baptists, etc. We avoid all such extravagant deductions by allowing the Scriptures to testify *to three things* pertaining to human government, viz., (1) its necessity; (2) its character; (3) its ultimate destiny. The *necessity* of having such government is grounded *in the constitution of man,* and is a legitimate outgrowth of his relations to society, finding its

support in the proposed protection and maintenance of mutual rights, privileges, etc. As such, it is *an ordinance* of God (just as man himself, society in its simplest form, the family relation, etc., are ordinances or appointments of God, resulting from established law), and so expressly declared in Rom. 13 : 1–5, while the particular form in which it is specifically manifested is also the ordinance or appointment of man (growing out of the former) and so designated 1 Pet. 2 : 13. In the absence of the contemplated Theocratic Kingdom, it is God's will and pleasure that men should, in order to avoid anarchy and greater evils, be placed under government, which, more or less, exerts a restraining influence—arising from moral law—upon the outbreaks of depravity. Therefore obedience, excepting only when God's law (Acts 4 : 19 and 5 : 29) is to be directly violated, is enjoined as a duty. But while this is so, and *necessarily follows* from the laws which God has established, it does not by any means assert that *the character* of such government is acceptable to Him, for the very power which Paul tells us is thus ordained by God is at the same time, so far as its character is concerned, described by the Spirit as "a Beast," exceedingly dreadful, etc., in Dan. 7 : 7, 19, 23 ; Rev. 17 : 4, 16, etc. Instead of being divine, it is beastial and wicked ; its conduct is denounced, and its doom declared. The same is true of the Babylonian and of all other kingdoms delineated in the Word of God, and the destiny of all of them is to perish ; but at the time, in the manner, and by the agencies, which God has also ordained. Man is not to assume that which God has placed in the hands of His own Son to accomplish, when the ordained "Times of the Gentiles" have come to an end. The visible Sovereignty of this world only becomes the Sovereignty of our Lord at the expiration of a pre-determined period, and for that we must patiently wait. In reference to the participation of believers in such government, the Word also gives a clear utterance ; while preserving integrity and indorsing it only in so far as it does right, we are to accept it, rendering obedience, as a necessity for the protection of society. When the Theocracy was overthrown the righteous Daniel and his companions found it justly compatible with the laws of God to hold official stations under the Babylonian monarchy. Before the Theocracy was established, the pious Joseph was thus associated in the Egyptian kingdom. After the Theocracy was delayed and the Times of the Gentiles announced, obedience is enjoined, the support of the government by the payment of taxes enforced, the protection of the government (as in the case of Paul) invoked, submission even under injustice recommended, the whole embraced by the general and yet special affirmation : "*Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.*"

Baldwin (*Armageddon*, Sec. 3, p. 26), gives place, in his one-sided eulogy of Republicanism, to a tirade against "all human monarchy," saying that God "hates it as a feature of hell and the devil," "that God considers human monarchy as exceeding sinful," "that God is therefore hostile to human monarchy because the system is iniquitous in principle, and he will destroy it because of its wicked nature." But he overlooks entirely, (1) that human government is necessary ; (2) that God Himself instituted and favored a monarchy ; (3) that, in the absence of a Theocratic government, God favors even monarchical governments as essential to the framework of society, and resulting from the laws instituted by Him ; (4) that God only regards governments, of every kind, with disfavor when the spirit, acts, etc., of the same are opposed to His truth and people; (5) and that human governments, so essential to avoid anarchy, are no longer to be tolerated *when* He sets up again His own Theocratic Kingdom under the Messiah, which Kingdom is not one dependent on the boasted and regenerating "Popular Sovereignty"

of Baldwin. Over against such wholesale denunciation, we have a remarkable delicacy manifested in Scripture. It has been noticed that in Daniel, when giving the succession of kingdoms to Nebuchadnezzar, the Spirit employs as symbols the precious and baser metals to indicate (ch. 2) the material progress, etc., but when the same Spirit delineates the same kingdoms for Daniel and His own people, he employs symbols expressive of *the character* sustained by them. We must be sufficiently candid to allow that the word "ordained" (Rom. 13 : 1–7) intimates the divine sanction, as agreeable to the divine will, because an essential agency in society, and discriminative in seeing that God has ordained many things that are perverted.

Obs. 2. This doctrine enables us to detect the fallacy in the writings of some devoted men (Fulton, etc.) when they *assume* the existence of Christ's kingdom as already established, believers being its subjects, etc., and then reason from this assumption that believers being already the subjects of an instituted kingdom, they must stand aloof from all human government.[1] Our whole argument utterly disproves such premise, demonstrating that the kingdom is postponed, and that believers, in virtue of their relationship to Christ, are only now "*heirs of the Kingdom.*" The Kingdom of the Messiah not being set up, and yet the relation of man to civil society making some form of government *an absolute necessity*; the believer is directed to conform to the present arrangement of things, *without sacrificing his Christian principle or violating the commands of God, until* the time that the King Himself comes. This is done too by way of trial and to prepare him, as well as the race, to appreciate more fully the Divine government of the Messiah when manifested. Man, as a punishment and a test, is left to work out his ideas of government practically in order, as the end will prove, that depravity in the highest exhibition of man's relations (i.e. in the civil) will gain the ascendency, and that human nature in the mass, when prosperity or greatness is attained, cannot withstand corruption. Hence it is, that these "heirs of the Kingdom" to come, are exhorted not to place their affections upon these things, and that eulogies of such human governments are lacking in God's Word ; for the Spirit ever keeps in view—whatever excellent and virtuous actions may be performed—*the great predicted fact* that the character and destiny of earthly kingdoms, as exhibited at the time of the Sec. Advent, renders them utterly unworthy of them. They become the instruments of persecution and cruelty (as even an inchoate fulfilment in the past evidences), culminating in one great combined confederation against God's people. The Spirit in forming His estimate looks at human government, not as it may present itself at this or that particular favorable crisis in history, but, at the general spirit and tendency which finally assumes full sway at the end. This leads us to add : while it is true that government is necessary, notwithstanding its past or future unfriendliness to the Church, it is owing to this manifestation of character that believers are exhorted to hold themselves in patience, and to anticipate for the future an increased wickedness, which will be severely afflictive to them ; to discharge their duties as far as possible and to suffer, if needs be, for the sake of the truth. This also gives a satisfactory answer to Shaftesbury, etc., who objects to the New Test. that it does not enjoin "patriotism" or an expression of love and esteem for the government under which believers may live. While it does give precepts, etc., which if followed out will largely contribute to the welfare of any government ; while it insists upon that which is right and just, and enjoins the same upon all, yet this distinctive point is indeed

lacking, and the reason is only additional evidence of *the Divine inspiration* of the Word, seeing that *the ultimate end* of such government is contemplated, and in view of the facts in relation to it, it would be against *both* the character and destiny of such government to enjoin "*the heirs*" of a future nobler government to come, and withdraw their hopes and affections from the latter, and set them upon that which is fated to miserably perish. Shaftesbury's objection is taking *a mere transient view* of government; the Bible considers its culminated wickedness and end still future. The simple truth is, as the Church will yet most painfully experience (Prop. 162), that this very government, for which unbelief calls for patriotic demonstrations, will yet *most bitterly persecute* her, so that the silence of Scripture complained of is fitting and just. Therefore, at present, we indorse Luther's position (Kurtz, *Ch. His.*) "that the Gospel secured spiritual liberty, but did not subvert civil government and social institutions," but enables us under such government to exemplify Christian character.[2]

[1] This is only bringing to a strictly logical conclusion a premise laid down by numerous writers. Thus e.g. Neander, advocating a present existing Kingdom of the Messiah, says: "The fundamental principle of the Christian community is, that there shall *be no other* subordination than that of its members to God and Christ, and that this shall be absolute," etc. Now while Neander himself, as is well known, would have protested against pushing this to its logical sequence, Fulton and others have done it. The truth is, that we are also, in this dispensation, to be individually subordinate, i.e. render obedience to civil power, but make the authority of God supreme. Many honest men, under a mistaken idea, unnecessarily excite against themselves odium by an attitude of unscriptural hostility to governments.

[2] How men have endeavored to give a degree of sanctity to Gentile government is apparent e.g. in anointing kings with "the holy unction," thus professing to transform them into "the Lord's anointed," of which Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, vol. 5, p. 29), sneeringly says: "this Jewish rite has been diffused and maintained by the superstition and vanity of modern Europe." This was supposed to confer a Divine or Theocratic right, and this "divine right of kings" was often exhibited in the most fantastic manner possible, as e.g. in the proudest of men and women regarding it an honor to perform the most menial of services, even to the holding and presenting the divine king's shirt, etc.

Obs. 3. This estimate and end of human government not only enables us to discard the Utopian notion of its development into a state of Perfectibility, but the attempted union of Church and State during the "Times of the Gentiles." The character and destiny of the State forbids such a union. The State, as now constituted, is selfish, and for the sake of self-interest, as the history of the past *painfully illustrates*, and as the history of the future *predicted* shows, will *sacrifice* the Church. The State, in the very nature of the case, cannot be safely attached to the Church, seeing that the sanctifying Theocratic element, which alone can elevate it to the position of a *truly* Christian organization in perfect unity with the religious, is lacking. The feeling, however, is greatly to be respected which would endeavor to bring about such a union with the idea that the highest interests of mankind in the highest form of organization should be the Protector and Advancer of truth and happiness. This feeling, so honorable, will be realized but not now; humanity, owing to depravity, is not prepared for it, and will not be, as predicted in this dispensation; it can only be verified under the Christ personally in *the covenanted* Theocratic Kingdom.

Many writers, not satisfied with a general supremacy of God over the nations of the

earth (Prop. 79)—God's ability to overrule, exert a divine providence—must unite with it the *Theocratic* element, as e.g. exemplified in the *Theocratic History of English History*, in which the adverse circumstances are carefully kept in the background, and the estimated providential brought forth prominently, and then men as honored divine instrumentalities are eulogized beyond their merits. While "God is in History," and the order of events are under His supervision and control, it is also true that no such alleged Theocratic rule exists, for that Theocratic relationship is confined to the Jewish nation and to the future. The fact is, that from the head of the image (Dan. 2) this existing world-dominion, can be denominated "Babylonish," seeing that the same spirit runs from the head to the feet. While the former dominion is taken away from Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedonia, yet the spirit actuating all such in the nations is perpetuated (Dan. 7 : 12), so that when the image is smitten on its feet and overthrown, we have virtually the whole image, (gold, silver, brass, and iron), representing this spirit of world dominion, also overthrown (Dan. 2 : 35, 45), for in the last world-power, the Roman, we have these included and intensified. As these empires are successive, we look for—as the analogy of Scripture teaches—a revival of the spirit of all these in the last head of the fourth beast, who dominates over the nations, and concentrates in himself their past hostility to God and man.

Obs. 4. The student, in corroboration of our position, will observe a singular feature, viz., that although the Roman Empire (and its divisions) has loudly proclaimed its profession of religion, appealed in laudation to its conversion under Constantine, praised itself as "most Christian," and even pronounced itself as a "Holy Empire," yet God, in view of no radical change, takes *no notice whatever* of all this boasted profession, and by this very significant silence (excepting in Rev. where the Empire is still recognized to be, as in Daniel, a "*beast*") places over against the extravagant eulogies of men *His own estimate* of such conversion and profession. The same is true of England, Germany, the United States, and others, for, notwithstanding the professed claim of "Christian nation," none of these receive *the slightest recognition* as such in the Word. The reason for such omission is self-evident.

In looking over the history of "Christian nations," we sometimes wonder that right and justice do not triumph over wrong and oppression. Thus e.g. when Russia, Prussia, and Austria proceeded to the spoliation of Poland, the Poles, in their declaration against this iniquitous measure, said : "And lastly, full of confidence in the justice of the Almighty, we lay our rights at the foot of His eternal throne, and put our cause into the hands of the King of kings, the Supreme Judge of nations ; and, in the full assurance of His succor, we protest solemnly and before the whole universe, against every step taken, or to be taken toward the dismemberment of Poland" (art. "Poland and the Poles," *Galaxy*, vol. 18, 1874, p. 40). This nation which was the least persecuting, the most tolerant, falls underneath the intolerant and highly professing Christian. Now while Poland itself, as its history too plainly attests, was but nominally Christian (and consequently in view of its character could not expect the divine blessing to answer a prayer *so confidently* expressed), and was dismembered by nominal Christian nations, yet God does not entirely disregard such a prayer and appeal. Those nations have suffered, and will yet more bitterly suffer, on account of their sins.

Obs. 5. It is a fact, as various able writers on the laws of the Theocracy have shown, that the nearer governments adopt, and carry out, the great principles underlying the Theocracy, the purer and more elevated is the civil polity, and the greater strength, security and happiness is imparted to all classes, rulers and ruled. The reverse of this holds true as exemplified in the history of nations ; for the greater the departure from those principles, the more oppressive and ruinous has been the result. But while this is so, the reader will not fail to notice that a mistake—serious—is made by supposing, that the Theocracy is merely given as a pattern—an enuncia-

tion of principles—for other governments to follow because it is to be superseded by others, instead of its being, as the Bible plainly predicts, for a time held in abeyance, owing to depravity, *until* the proper material is gathered out for its overwhelming inauguration.

Hence able writers (as Wines, Michaelis, Graves, Lowman, Jahn, and others), while justly noticing the political features of the Theocracy, and showing how worthy of adoption by the nations are its fundamental principles, either overlook, or are in ignorance of this divine intention ; and besides they do not realize the simple fact that that which gave vitality and force to a Theocracy (viz., *God's personally acting as the Ruler of the nation*) is lacking in all other governments, and, therefore, no other can *possibly hope* to be substituted in its place. Again, men of the highest eminence assume the perpetuity of earthly governments from the fact that man is so constituted by God that he must, in view of his adaptedness, live under some form of government—that society cannot properly exist without it—that it commends itelf as a positive necessity, etc. Now while it is true that civil government is required, yet the perpetuity of the same in the way advocated *does not follow*. On the other hand, the Bible distinctly teaches, that until God claims, by an actual re-establishment of His Theocracy, the Sovereignty of the world, these civil governments must, even if under beastial influence, exist in order to meet the requirements and necessities of man. God ordains their existence as a necessity springing from man's constitution, but *only until* the Theocracy is revealed. Then the highest possible form of civil (united with the religious) government *shall be substituted* for the present forms. Civil government is not set aside (for this is forbidden by the nature of man, the demands of social position, the continued aptitude and necessity for government, the analogy drawn from God's working, nature, uses of government etc.), but it is set forth in its *God-given and God-enforced form*, abrogating the mere human form. The fact that civil government, as now constituted, is the result of the Divine Will, and that obedience is inculcated as a duty, etc., does not necessitate its perpetuity. All depends on the Divine Will, and we must form our conclusions respecting the future in accordance *with the declarations of that Will*. It has never, in any place, asserted the perpetuity of earthly governments, but the exact reverse. That Will, and its contemplated expressed determination, is the foundation of the Coming Theocracy, and that Will shall be made manifest in the Theocratic person and rule of Jesus "the Christ." This effectually settles the question of perpetuity and the predictions based upon it.

To indicate how others express themselves on the subjects embraced in this and the previous Prop., a few illustrations are in place. Fausset (*Com.*, Dan. 7) remarks: "Daniel sees the world kingdoms in their essence as of an *animal* nature lower than the human, being estranged from God ; and that only in the Kingdom of God ('the Son of Man,' the representative Man) is the true dignity of man realized." "Nebuchadnezzar's colossal image represents mankind in his own strength, but only the outward man. Daniel sees man spiritually degraded to the beast level, led by blind impulses, through his alienation from God. It is only from above that the perfect Son of Man comes, and in His Kingdom man attains his true destiny. Cf. Ps. 8 with Gen. 1 : 26–28. Humanity is impossible without divinity ; it sinks to beastiality (Ps. 32 : 9, and 49 : 20, and 73 : 22). Obstinate heathen nations are compared to 'bulls' (Ps. 68 : 30) ; Egypt, to the dragon in the Nile (Isa. 27 : 1, and 51 : 9 ; Ezek. 29 : 3). The animal with all its sagacity looks always to the ground, without consciousness of relation to God. What elevates man is communion with God, in willing subjection to Him. The moment he tries to exalt himself to independence of God, like Nebuchadnezzar (ch. 4 : 30), he sinks to the beast's level." Lange's *Com.*, Dan. 7, Doc. 5, remarks : "The ideal and fundamental thought of the prophecy, which substantially coincides with that of the image of the monarchies in chap. 2, and may be expressed by the statement, 'that all the kingdoms of the earth must be put to shame' (Rev. 11 : 15 ; 12 : 10) before the Kingdom of the everlasting God and of His Anointed, must evidently be made prominent" (without entering largely into "the details of its realization in the history of the world"). The same gives the Tübingen Bible as declaring : "In His eternal decree God has fixed a limit to every kingdom ; beyond this it cannot go, and the Divine Providence exerts a special agency to this end." "How uncertain is the glory and majesty of the kingdoms of earth ! Even when they have attained to the highest prosperity they must yet be humbled, fall, and pass away, like every other earthly good and honor. The Kingdom of Heaven alone is immutable, and forms the hope of every believer, Ps. 145 : 13." Such expressions drawn from the writings of Auberlen (*On Daniel*), Newton (*Diss. on Proph.*), and many others might be presented.

PROPOSITION 166. *The rudimentary reorganization of this Kingdom will be made at Mt. Sinai.*

The organization of the Theocracy was affected *before* the Jewish nation entered Palestine. The appointment of officials, the giving of laws, the commandments to destroy the enemies of God, etc., were issued at Mt. Sinai. It is eminently suitable that the *reorganization* of the *same* should be effected in the *same* place. The reasons will be adduced in the following observations.

This is one of the Propositions, which, if torn from its connection, can be injuriously employed against us. The writer felt the force of Prov. 12 : 23 " a prudent man concealeth knowledge," but in view of the importance of the subject, its instructiveness especially pertaining to the interval, and the encouragements to instruct, etc., he felt persuaded that in this case, Prov. 13 : 16," every prudent man dealeth with knowledge," and Prov. 15 : 2, " the tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright," insured its presentation to be acceptable to the class whose good-will we ought to esteem. We only now say that this Prop. serves to clear up some—otherwise—difficult passages. Thus e.g. it throws light on the question where Jesus and the saints are during the interval ; on the fact that during the interval Jesus is spoken of as being present on the earth ; on the setting up and existence of thrones (Rev. 20 : 4) indicative of a formative Kingdom ; on the stages of the same Advent ; on the object of the first res. and translation ; on the Kingdom not coming with observation, being concealed and sudden ; on the hatred and intentions of the Antichrist ; on the march of the Christ and His saints ; on the subsequent war and its results ; and on various Mill. predictions.

Obs. 1. Taking it for granted that the Theocracy will be again reorganized in its Theocratic-Davidic form, so that God in the person of David's descendant (inseparably connected) *again condescends to dwell with* the Jewish nation, and *act in the capacity of an earthly ruler*, we may suggest, that if such is the divine order, no place on earth could be selected *more suitable or better adapted* for such an arrangement than *Mt. Sinai*, and its adjoining territory. It is a place so isolated, separated from other countries, that such a work undertaken would, for a time, at least, attract but little attention among other nations. It lies at the same time contiguous to the inheritance of David's Son, which at the time will be sorely pressed by the Antichrist with its confederated power. The Holy Land occupied, as it then will be, by the forces of enemies, and all other lands having their kingdoms or civil power in full sway, *forbids* in them a peaceful, previous arrangement as indicated ; and *hence* this locality, surrounded by its sandy deserts, under no special civil jurisdiction, occupied only by wandering tribes, is well adapted to secure, as it once did before, *uninterrupted facilities* for a preliminary national organization. Besides this, it is a place *already highly distinguished*, having enjoyed the presence of God, and having witnessed the entrance of God and people into *the desirable Theocratic relationship*, being honored by the camp of the elect nation, and the manifestations of the King, made memorable by the giving of the law, and expressly pronounced, in view of its associations, to be " *holy*." In all

respects, therefore, considering that the nations will then be hostile to the Saviour (in fact arrayed against Him), it is of all places the one *most suitable* to be used for such a purpose. The question is, do the Scriptures give us sufficient intimations to believe the Proposition? We shall present the reasons for holding to such a belief, premising (1) that they are *not nearly so indistinctive* as predictions relating to the First Advent; and (2) that, if mistaken in this particular, *it cannot* affect our main leading argument, which is independent of the discussion of minor points relating to the order or introduction of the Kingdom, upon which differences of opinion are reasonably to be anticipated.

The critical student will observe (what Mede on the one hand, and Brown on the other, insist on) that Dan. 2 : 44 particularly declares that "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." That is, *previous* to the final ending of the Roman Empire, of Gentile domination, of the horns that arise, this kingdom will be already commenced, organized. These writers, Bengel, and many others, declare that the position assigned *to the time* of setting up the Messianic Kingdom must be maintained in order to meet the conditions annexed. This Sinaitic view meets them fully, and in the only place, and under the only circumstances possible, in view of the conflicts in Idumea and Palestine. It harmonizes all the predictions, and presents us with *an easy Scriptural solution* of what otherwise would be full of difficulties.

Obs. 2. In considering this subject, some preliminary matters must be duly regarded, viz. (1) That the most prominent students of prophecy are now agreed that the Second Advent, to be appreciated, must be comprehended in its *several phases*, being *at first* secret, hidden to carry out certain purposes, and *finally* open, revealed. The reasons for this belief are given under Prop. 130. (2) That the First Advent, embracing within itself about thirty-three years, teaches us not *to limit* the acts of Jesus at the Second within a brief period of time; and that His preparatory private life of about thirty years before His open manifestation to the nation, should lead us not to circumscribe His Second Advent to an immediate open Revelation, unless a comparison of Scripture makes it absolutely necessary. (3) That if it be admitted that the establishment of the Theocracy at Mt. Sinai was a pattern of something that should follow in the future (which nearly all writers confess however much they may differ in the ultimate fulfilment), *then* an open door is at once presented for the introduction of our Proposition. (4) That the passages bearing on this subject are to be considered in their *general scope*, in their *connection* with context and analogy, and shall involve *no contradiction* of Scripture.

The student will also observe the following: (1) that dispensations may, as the Jewish and Gospel *overlap* each other for some years; (2) that this Theocratic Kingdom is reorganized *before* the times of the Gentiles are ended; (3) the breaking and consuming process upon which the Kingdom immediately enters, is expressive of *a previous* organization—for it is evidently an intelligent organized force that is set in motion against the kings of the earth and their armies; (4) Rev. 10 : 7 implies, in view of finishing the mystery of God (which appertains to the Kingdom), that to the believing there will be such a manifestation, that *before* the epoch is concluded this will be done; (5) the Coming of the Son of Man *in* His Kingdom (implying a previous organization) is to be distinguished from His thief-like Coming.

Obs. 3. The Bible seems to declare that Jesus, the Messiah, at His Second Advent, will especially exhibit *two* acts or phases in this Coming, and *between* these two, He and His saints will pass *the intervening period at Mt. Sinai.* That he comes "as a thief" *for* the removal of the saints

is clearly taught, and that He also openly comes *with* these saints on the Mt. of Olives (Zech. 14 : 4) is unmistakably announced. But He and His saints are *also* represented as being *at Mt. Sinai.* A comparison of Scripture shows, that when the saints are removed by the power of resurrection and translation, they do *not remain in* "*the air,*" but are conveyed *to Mt. Sinai*, where, as at the establishment of the Theocracy, *positions* are assigned, *the kingship and priesthood* inaugurated, the *instructions* given preparatory to the ushering in of "the dispensation of the fulness of times." After all the preparations are completed, and the time has come for "*the manifestation of the sons of God,*" the deliverance of the Jewish nation, the destruction of Antichrist, *this associated body of Rulers with the King of kings at their head* (Rev. 19) present themselves to the confusion of all enemies, and to the joy of the ancient elect nation. Let the reader ponder the 68th Psalm, and its references to Mt. Sinai. This Psalm, allowing its prophetic character, was *never fulfilled,* as is generally supposed, at the appearing of God in the wilderness at the institution of the Theocracy. The reasons are the following : (1) the description is *too exalted* to meet the facts as they transpired in the wilderness, in the march to Canaan, and in obtaining possession of the land. The comparative feebleness and repeated transgressions of the nation ; their inability, owing to sin, to extend their power as here predicted ; the continued existence of their enemies ; their final subjection to other nations, etc.—all this is opposed to the spirit of the Psalm. (2) The Psalm is *Messianic,* and relates not to the past but to *the future.* This is proven by the direct reference and application of a portion of the Psalm to Christ. This is done by Paul in Eph. 4 : 9, where he applies it as significant of results produced by the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. The Spirit thus gives us *a key* to its interpretation. (3) Its reference to the future is *evinced* by its allusion to the resurrection (v. 20) ; the great slaughter and complete overthrow of all enemies (v. 1–3, 14, 21–23, 30) ; the restoration of the Jewish nation (see v. 22 and notice force of "again") although oppressed by a multitude ("sea") ; the restoration of Theocratic rule (v. 24–35) ; the kings of the earth bringing presents, and the extended, world-wide dominion exerted (v. 29–35). On the other hand, what is here delineated to occur *corresponds fully and accurately* in every respect with the predictions pertaining to the ushering in of the Millennial age or Christ's Kingdom. *Then,* we know, the enemies will indeed be removed as here described ; *then* the exaltation, the purity, beauty, rejoicing, safety, and power of the righteous will be witnessed as here portrayed ; *then* the dwelling of God with man, the exertion of supernatural power, the power of delivering from death, the restoration of the people, the universal dominion, the re-organization of the nation under rulers, kings coming to present their allegiance and worship at Jerusalem, nations submitting themselves, the praise and glory manifested—*all this, as here predicted, will come to pass.* Hence seeing that the general tenor of the Psalm does not suit the history of the past, in the non-fulfilment of large portions of it, but faithfully describes the future, it is not an arbitrary act to interpret verses 8 and 17 *as also realized in the future,* and this the more readily because this Advent *accords* with what is ascribed to Christ at His Second Coming. Let the mighty King come as predicted in other places, and there is nothing in these verses, unless it be *the locality* designated, which differs from the others. But why object to the specified locality? Can a reason be as-

signed for the rejection of it in such a connection? No, we are content to receive it as it reads, believing that as Sinai at the inauguration of the Theocracy witnessed *the presence of the Theocratic King,* so when God's Son comes to restore the Theocratic rule "*even Sinai itself is moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel*" (v. 8.), and in view of His surroundings it can be said (v. 17) "*the chariots of God are twenty thousand* (*myriads*) *even thousands of angels* (*even many thousands or thousands of heavenly powers*); *the Lord is among them as in*" (or simply, "*in*" or "*so Sinai among the holy mountains,*" as rendered by Lederer) "*Sinai in the holy place.*"[1] Accepting of the Psalm as *a prophetic* announcement of the future, it is impossible, without violence, to rid ourselves of the persuasion that at the future Advent *the Messiah will appear* not only on the Mt. of Olives, but *antecedently on Mt. Sinai,* where evidently the gathering together occurs, with which gathered body Christ is afterward accompanied. In all this, there is *eminent propriety,* if we but consider that this Theocratic Kingdom is to be restored and manifested through the Seed of David, and hence in its relations to humanity and to the Jewish race, *necessarily requires* an outward exhibition of its earthly reinauguration. There is also *a peculiar fitness* in the choice of place where this is done, inasmuch as *Sinai itself* is identified with the organization pertaining to Theocratic rulership.[2]

[1] Reineke, *Proph. Times,* Nov., 1864, p. 163, renders "The horsemen of God are two companies of myriads, thousands of changed ones; the Lord in them Sinai in holiness," or "The horsemen of God are two companies of thousands of myriads; the Lord in them Sinai in holiness." Rabbi Greenabaum renders the verses: "The earth quaked, also the heaven dropped at the presence of God; yea this Sinai, at the presence of God, the God of Israel." "The chariots of God are two myriads; thousands of angels follow him; the Lord is among them, so is Sinai holy among mountains." Lange's *Com.,* Exeg. has "Yon Sinai before the face of Elohim, the God of Israel," and "The Chariots of God are myriads, thousands and again thousands, the Lord among them, a Sinai in sanctity."

[2] Sinai was even esteemed holy before the giving of the law (Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine,* p. 48, Josephus, *Ant.,* 3, v. 1), and the only reason that can be satisfactorily assigned is that pertaining to its foreknown Theocratic usage, making it a special favorite of God's. What a distinguished place Mt. Sinai will be in the future ages! The place of God's marriage (so according to Oriental usage, the inauguration of a Ruler), with the Jewish nation; the place where Jesus' marriage takes place before the bridal procession proceeds to Jerusalem. God in view of this, may, as we anticipate, adorn the wilderness and make it a place of resort. We cannot help but feel that Elijah will again, under far different circumstances, visit this place. This prophet visited Horeb (Smith's *Bib. Dic.* makes Sinai and Horeb—the latter standing in the shadow of the former—to be used interchangeably as e.g. Deut. 1 : 2, 6, 19, and 4 : 10, 15, and 9 : 8, and 29 : 1, 1 Kings 8 : 9, and 19 : 8, and 2 Chron. 5 : 10; Mal. 4 : 4) when persecuted (1 Kings 19), and in "the mount of God" found special nearness to God, and realized that, amid the general defection, God had reserved for Himself a people. How changed the relations, and what a glorious reservation he will there meet! If faithful our glad eyes will behold the same, and our glad hearts will associate with those "myriads."

Obs. 4. If this deduction were founded simply on one passage it might suggest doubt, but we find it sustained in other places. Thus take Deut. 33 : 1–2, which embraces the blessings pronounced on the several tribes, and which from other predictions we know shall only be fully realized *at the restoration* of the nation *at the Second Coming* of its King. Now these blessings are introduced by a description which, however applicable in some particulars to the giving of the law, was *never verified* in the past. For we read: "*The Lord came from Sinai and rose up from Sier unto them, He shined forth from Mt. Paran, and He came with ten thousands of*

saints; from His right hand went a fiery law to them," etc.[1] Such a Coming with myriads of saints is *only predicated* of the still future Advent. We have no account of any other, and this correspondence with what will occur at the predicted Second Advent of Jesus (when myriads of saints are with Him) is indicative of its intended application. In Hab. 3 : 3 we have another allusion. Intending to refer to the chapter at length in another place, it is sufficient to say that the opinion so generally held that it refers to the past manifestation of God at Mt. Sinai and in the wilderness, is *utterly untenable.* Aside from various considerations, the simple fact that the prophet himself locates it in the future and prays (v. 16) that he may find deliverance *when* it takes place, is ample to remove the prevailing interpretation. It most certainly—if we preserve its unity and compare with other Scripture—pertains to the future Advent. The prophet tells us "*God came from Teman* (or the South) *and the Holy One from Mt. Paran,*" at a time when an overthrow of enemies and a deliverance is experienced on a scale *so great* that the past sinks into insignificance before it. Even Judges 5 : 4, 5, may in the mind of the Spirit be far-reaching; and many predictions respecting "the wilderness" may have a deeper, more significant meaning than is usually attached to them. Let there be such a restoration of Theocratic rule inaugurated at Mt. Sinai, and it imparts new force to Isa. 35 : 1 "*the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them and the desert shall rejoice,*" etc., or to Isa. 32 : 15, 16 "*the wilderness* (*shall*) *be a fruitful field,*" "*then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness,*" or to Isa. 35 : 6 "*for in the wilderness shall waters* (i.e. people) *break out and streams in the desert.*" In view of the apportionment of the stations, etc., in the Kingdom at such a time and place, it may even be questioned whether the planting in the wilderness of those several trees mentioned by Isa. 41 : 19, 20 is not to be interpreted of the assignments of rank, etc., in this Theocracy, seeing that the Spirit likens in other places the saints to "*Trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord*" (Isa. 61 : 3), and men and rulers are thus designated. The specific mention of rejoicing, shouting, singing, etc., in the wilderness at some period still future is seen, if this idea is accepted, to be highly appropriate, and what under the circumstances is to be anticipated. Surely "*the grace in the wilderness,*" Jer. 31 : 2, which is yet, as the prophecy indicates, to be realized by the Jewish nation in an unexampled restoration; the pleading in the wilderness, Ezek. 20 : 35–36) still future with that people; the speaking comfortably to His people in the wilderness, Hos. 2 : 14—this, with similar intimations, should teach us that the wilderness, just as in the beginning, is an important feature strikingly *associated with* the re-establishment of the Theocracy.[2]

[1] Lederer, *The Israelite Indeed*, Dec., 1863, p. 141, renders it: "Jehovah is coming from Sinai, and rises unto them from Seir; He beams from Mt. Paran, and comes (out) from the myriads of saints, from His right hand (the) fire statue unto them," etc. This "fiery law" or "fire statue" is also, as every one can see, a distinguishing characteristic of the Sec. Advent with the saints, being expressive of "judgments."

[2] Hos. 2 : 14 deserves special attention, and the connection evidently shows the time of fulfilment to be in the future. If the student observes two things he cannot fail to catch its spirit. (1) The elect now gathered being engrafted, and thus become identified with the true Israel, are inseparable with this period of blessing; (2) the time of this marriage, Pre-Millennial, as noticed Props. 118, 169, etc. Ps.74 : 14 will be impressively realized: "Thou breakest the heads of leviathan in pieces, and gavest him to be meat to the people inhabiting (sojourning in) the wilderness."

Obs. 5. Isa. 63 : 1–6 cannot possibly, without the grossest inconsistency, be applied to the First Advent of Jesus. For, aside from other reasons, it is not true that He then came in anger, fury and vengeance, and shed the blood of His enemies, until His own garments were stained, seeing that His mission was one of love, mercy and submission to death. But at His Second Advent numerous passages *expressly mention* wrath, vengeance on enemies, and a fearful slaughter and supper. It is therefore a description *only applicable* to the Second Advent, as the early Church taught (see Prop. 121)[1]. But the prophet in vision sees Him Coming from the direction of Mt. Sinai, asking : "*Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?*" Indeed, when we come to compare Scripture with Scripture, we have *the route* taken by the mighty King *from Mt. Sinai until He arrives at Jerusalem* clearly pointed out. Prophecy distinctly mentions Mt. Sinai, Paran, the Wilderness, Mt. Seir, Edom, Teman or the South, Bozrah, giving us *a direct route* from Sinai *northward* to Palestine. This does not occur *by chance, but is descriptive of what shall truly take place.* Having the Mighty One with His Saints manifested at Sinai, and also by way of the wilderness of Paran on through Idumea, it seems to us faithless not to accept of these things. Especially when we find an under-current of prophecy, which serves to bring them out in more distinctive proportions.[2] Thus, e.g. in "*the new thing*" (Isa. 43 : 18–21), which God is to perform, He "*will even make a way in the wilderness, rivers* (notice its figurative meaning) *in the desert.*[3] *I give waters in the wilderness and rivers in the deserts, to give drink to my people, my chosen. This people have I formed for myself; they shall show forth my praise.*" Here we have intimated under impressive figures the blessings that will result from a re-formation of Theocratic rule out of a people expressly raised up (and gathered) for this purpose, and this is done *in the wilderness, the very place where the Theocracy was originally instituted.* If such a restoration as the Proposition states is really contemplated and intended, could the language of the prophet be *more expressive* of the fact? The saints, that body of "*peculiar people*" and engrafted, thus constituting the "*holy nation*" (and thus forming "*a river,*" etc., in the figurative language of Scripture), gathered to Mt. Sinai, and associated with Christ in *the formative reorganization of the fallen Theocracy,* would fulfil in the most impressive manner such predictions. Then again, if we turn to Isa. 40 : 3, it is extremely doubtful whether we have more than a mere typical fulfilment in John's mission. And, when the prediction is carefully studied in the light of other predictions, the doubt resolves itself into a certainty that this also (whatever inchoate fulfilment there may be) refers to this period of time. Let the reader notice (1) that this cry in the wilderness, etc., is taken as commentators, Barnes, etc., inform us from the approach of a mighty Conqueror, and *is expressive of irresistible power and a triumphant march;* (2) that the preparations are suitably completed, and "*the glory of the Lord shall be revealed*" so that "*all flesh shall see it;*" (3) that before the march of Jehovah, all flesh being as grass, *opposition* shall be overcome ; (4) and the results of this triumphal appearance *in deliverance and rule.* To say that *all this* was strictly fulfilled at the First Advent, having before us the rejection of John, and Jesus, in the triumph of enemies, and no such experience of deliverance of the nation, etc., as delineated, is certainly a lowering and altering of the prophecy. On the other hand, the offer of the Kingdom at the First Advent *necessitated* a typical representa-

tion of this act in the wilderness (and hence applied to John), but owing to the foreknown unbelief and sinfulness of the nation *both* the Kingdom and the real preparatory acts here predicted were postponed. Jesus did not exhibit Himself as the King; His glory was concealed under humiliation; *the time had not yet arrived* for such a triumphal passage; He Himself locating it in the future at His Sec. Coming. Admit such a re-establishment of the Theocracy at Mt. Sinai in the wilderness—consider the route from there through the wilderness to Judea, and *then* the prophecy shines forth with a clearness and vividness that is startling. "*The Voice of him that crieth in the wilderness,*[4] *Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God*"—the completeness of the preparation, the majestic march revealing the glory of the Lord, the helplessness of His enemies contrasted with His power, the reward bestowed, the blessed rule and safety experienced; *all evince* such an exalted condition of manifested Kingly authority, etc., and connected with, as a starting point, *the wilderness,* that it is only to be fulfilled in the future. At least such a fulfilment *accords* with the glory of the Lord, and His work as connected with the Second Advent, and we can see no valid reason to reject its indentification, in some way, *with the wilderness,* as the place *from whence* this King of kings comes, and before whom "a highway," like that of a mighty conqueror, shall be opened. Such passages include the idea, that *the authoritative manifestation of Theocratic rule* is exhibited, before it issues forth *from the desert.* It is a form *ready for action* before it emerges from the wilderness. Considering the formation of the Theocracy with its added hosts of kings and priests in so isolated a place, secluded from the observation of the nations, and its *sudden and overwhelming appearance,* it may be a question whether Christ had not this initiatory stage in view when He told the Pharisees, "*the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation,*" seeing that it is not only divinely instituted, but this is done in a secluded manner and place, so that when it appears it is *already so organized as to be irresistible,* etc.[5]

[1] The reader will find information in Lange's *Com.* Isa. ch. 63, showing that Calvin, Musculus, Schultetus, and others, rejected the idea of its application to the passion of Jesus, and Vitringa expressly says: "the hero is not set forth as *suffering* but as *acting,* not as sprinkled with *His own blood* but with the blood of *enemies,* not as satisfying the justice of God *for sins* but as executing the justice of God in *punishing enemies.*" Ziethe is quoted as saying: "Our text (Isa. 63 : 1–6) bids us (1) To look on the Man of Sorrows, who redeemed us; (2) To contemplate in faith the great work which He has accomplished for us; (3) For this to render to Him the thank-offering which we owe Him"—upon which the American editor (Rev. Moore) justly observes: "It is strange that an eminent modern preacher should *so misrepresent* the teaching of this passage. If we wish to lead men to contemplate Christ as the Man of Sorrows, by whose blood we are redeemed, we should choose a passage of Scripture that exhibits Him in this character. But it is either culpable ignorance, or something worse, to affirm that the Scripture before us contains the lessons set forth in the above mentioned heads of a sermon." Many, alas deserve this rebuke and even Bh. Hobart (*Works,* vol. 3. p. 298), has a sermon arbitrarily applying it to the sacrifice on the cross. Steir is of the opinion that the one who is seen as coming is Christ, "coming from the fulfilment of what is related Rev. 14 : 20, and 19 : 18, 21." "The destruction of Antichrist is regarded by Delitzsch simply as the New Test. counterpart to this piece." And Weber is thus quoted: "The prophecy which is here directed against Edom is to be regarded as a prophecy of the judgment which will befall the antichristian, persecuting world in the last days. On this account the Seer of the New Test., John, has described the Lord as coming to judge the world after the model of Isa. 63 (Rev. 19)." The Amer. editor says: "Messiah is the conqueror of Edom as Balaam of old predicted (Numb. 24 : 17, 18). *Not till He raises up the fallen tabernacle of David,* is possession in the highest sense taken of Edom

and of all the heathen (Amos 9 : 11, 12). As we understand the Lord's work of destruction depicted in Ps. 110 : 5, 6, so must we understand the judgment on Edom here described." We only add, that nearly all expositors not knowing what else to do with the names "Edom" and "Bosrah" have regarded them as mystical or figurative terms expressive of enemies, but this view gives a deeper significance to them—just as the names relating to the First Advent. Hannah's prayer will be verified (1 Sam. 2), and the nations (Zeph. 3 : 8, etc.), be crushed under the long predicted (Deut 32 : 41–43) vengeance. If the reader turn to Props. 115 and 163, he will find by connecting the same with this one, additional reasons for our position.

[2] The student will observe that the place where the First Advent occurred is but indirectly given, and that all other accounts of the same imply the coming first to Bethlehem. So in the Sec. Advent, when the locality is once stated that is amply sufficient, and all other predictions imply it. This at once opens a wide field for reference which can only be indicated. Thus e.g. take Isa. 63 : 1–6, and notice in connection the vengeance, the Redemption, etc. This compared with numerous parallel passages presents us additional points of identification. Such a comparison having been instituted under various Propositions, it is not requisite to repeat. Several passages not before specified, may briefly be suggested : Isa. 42 : 11, is remarkable, as the context indicates that "new things" are to be performed, introducing Millennial blessedness and glory, worthy of "a new song." This is done in the manner we have advocated : "The Lord shall go forth as a mighty man, He shall stir up jealousy like a man of war, He shall cry, yea war ; He shall prevail against His enemies," etc. (see context). But notice verse 11, and its manifest allusions (as Bh. Lowth, and others), to the desert of Arabia Deserta, to the rocky country of Arabia Petræa, etc., and surely the careful student of the Word must be impressed that *some deep reason* underlies such references. What other reason so applicable as the one advocated by us? For aught we know, such references as Zech. 9 : 14, going "with whirlwinds of the South ;" as Ps. 126 : 4, "as streams in the South ;" and similar phraseology, may contain allusions which a fulfilment will render expressive in this direction. The student will not overlook Isa. 9 : 1 (Delitzsch's rendering), Isa. 59 : 16–20 (comp Lowth and the Chaldee).

[3] Delitzsch's rendering is impressive : "Behold I work out a new thing : will ye not live to see it" (resurrection)? "Yea, I make a road through the desert," etc.

[4] Lowth and Noyes separate the clause as follows : A voice crieth, "*In the wilderness prepare ye the way of Jehovah,*" and Barnes *loci* declares "the parallelism seems to require the translation proposed by Lowth." This, if correct, would add to its significancy. So Delitzsch : "Hark a crier ! *In the wilderness prepare ye* a way for Jehovah, make smooth in the desert a road for our God."

[5] An additional reason is found in Prop. 163 on the meaning of "Armageddon" (which see), and to this idea of "the Assembling" or "the Gathering" many passages refer, as e.g. Ps. 110 : 3 (Barker's Bible, London 1815, renders), "Thy people shall come willingly *at the time of the assembling thine army in holy beauty,*" etc. Ps. 46 according to the title refers to "*the hidden ones or virgins,*" and is highly expressive of this period (comp. Isa. 26 : 20, 21 ; Jer. 2 : 3 ; Luke 21 : 36, etc.). Even the "fleeing to the mountain" of Ps. 11 : 1, if we are to receive some renderings, may refer to this withdrawal. The passages which speak of the removal and hiding of God's people just before the last great tribulation breaks forth might be used as illustrative of this period. Here, indeed, they would be in safety and honor. The world will be more or less unconscious of this gathering, the days of Noah repeating themselves, and persistent unbelief in such a preparation existing until too late. The secrecy of all this, is plainly implied, even in the meeting of the Bridegroom and those that were ready, which no one of the world will witness. Those taken to Mt. Sinai are pre-eminently favored, and as then "the door will be shut" it will be too late for others to be added to the special blessed number. These are "the firstfruits" of the harvest—specially belonging to the Lord—the harvest itself—"the great multitude"—follows later in the divine order. Various passages relating to this subject are worthy of consideration, such as Isa. 16 : 1–5 ; Isa. chs. 34, 35, 13, etc. When these things are realized, men will be amazed to find *how largely and minutely,* all this has been described in the Word, and yet *how little* it has been noticed and appreciated, just as the things relating to the First Advent were overlooked.

There is only one difficulty, suggested by a friend (Dr. Morehead), viz., that in Rev. 19 at the open Advent of Jesus and His saints it is represented that "heaven opened" and "the armies in heaven followed Him," so that He and the saints literally come from the third heaven and not from Sinai, etc. But this is simply to overlook the symbolical meaning of the word "heaven" as used in Revelation. If we are to give it this meaning,

then e.g. ch. 12 : 7 there was literally "war in heaven," ch. 4 : 1, 2, John was literally in heaven, etc. Hence all commentators e.g. Barnes, Lange, etc., refer the expression to the introduction of a new vision and its relation to the heavenly powers. Faber, etc., give us correct ideas of its reference, and, for aught we know, if reference is made to the same heaven mentioned in ch. 6 : 13, it would be sustained if the symbolical import is accepted, and even if the literal, without including the third heaven (for Jesus and His saints can and will come transported in the aerial by supernatural power). A consistent interpretation of the Word in accordance with its usage (see Prop. 107) in the book will remove the objection ; and we are not to force the language, just as we do not that which relates or pertains to the sword out of His mouth, etc. It is a symbolical representation of the authority, majesty, power, etc., of the Advent.

Obs. 6. This view instead of conflicting with the other predictions, serves *to illustrate and enforce them.* Take, e.g. Dan. 7, and there is something remarkable in the structure of the prophecy, which on any other hypothesis baffles interpretation. The investiture (Prop. 83) of the Son of Man, David's Son, with the Kingdom, and the bestowment of judgment or rulership upon the saints associated with Him, is done *by the Ancient of Days*, for the Kingdom is given by Him to the Son of Man and His saints. But this is done here *on* the earth—as the representation in its entire scope demands—even while the Antichristian power, so arrogant and hostile, is in existence and holds sway over the nations. A difficulty at once presents itself, *how* could such an investiture which presupposes an order of arrangements, etc., take place without exciting immediate attention and attack from the enemy if conducted *within* his territory and in *a public* manner. The prophecy implies on its face a perfectly free unembarrassed, and even unexpected by the enemy, accomplishment of *preliminary arrangements* pertaining to the Kingdom. Admit that Sinai and the wilderness is the locality where the Ancient of Days invests David's Son and His own with Theocratic power, and bestows upon Him and the saints the convenanted dominion, and the difficulty vanishes. The prophet looks in vision at the horn, and then, looking away from him, turns to gaze upon the prophetic picture presented at Mt. Sinai without specifying the locality ; thus passing from one to the other without a commingling of them. Although the investiture (i.e. the public official recognition in the presence of holy intelligences) is *on* the earth, yet it is effectually concealed from the interference and annoyance of the powerful enemy which it is to destroy. Such an explanation, to say the least, is more natural and reasonable—if the Theocracy is indeed to be restored in David's Son—than that usually given, which, against *the Coming* of the Ancient One and the evident description of scenes witnessed *on earth*, makes this a transaction in the third heaven. When the Theocracy was originally established, it was done amid the most solemn and glorious manifestations, and *Mt. Sinai* was purposely selected for the same ; now when *the same* Theocracy is to be reorganized in *the most august* manner under the leadership of *the King* specially provided, *is it not reasonable* that (instead of the third heaven or the air, etc.) it should be effected in precisely *the same place* and with exhibitions of splendor and power *far more impressive* than any hitherto given.[1] Is it not also suitable that such an arrangement when taking place *on* earth, should receive *the most solemn outward official sanction of the Most High God?*[2]

[1] There is nothing whatever in the Scriptures which teaches directly or indirectly that Jesus during this interval is in the third heaven. Wilson (*Proph. Times*, N. S., Aug., 1877, p. 183), correctly makes an extended period between the two stages, but misled by the

withdrawal of the saints to the air (or aerial), concludes that Christ and His saints are in the air during the forty years. But his view of an organized form of government being established during this interval is eminently just : " And so, when they shall come with Christ at the end of the forty years they will be a completely organized body politic." To apply the title " Ancient of Days" to the Son is harsh and utterly untenable, although many do this, not knowing how else to interpret it, although the prophecy distinguishes *between* the two, the one being the giver and the other the receiver. We cannot receive the view that this investiture is a transaction in the third heaven, as held by Tregelles and others, because the Ancient of Days Coming (v. 22) and the Coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven (v. 13), cannot have a reference to the third heaven, but, as the entire tenor of the prophecy demands, is a Coming to this earth *where* the judgment is to be executed and the rule enforced. Hence we cannot receive Fausset's (*Com.* Dan. 7 : 13) that this Coming and investiture was " at His ascension," and this title is exercised invisibly, but "at His Second Coming it shall be in visible administration," for this violates the unity of the prediction by the introduction of an interval utterly unauthorized, and is based on a misapprehension of the Kingdom that belongs to *the Son of Man as David's Son.* This investiture is certainly not witnessed before the rise of the ten horns, the little horn, etc., and before the time has arrived for judgment (upon which the action of the Ancient of Days is founded). The only interpretation that we can safely follow is the one that does not violate the natural order, relating to time and events, given in the prophecy. The Ancient of Days did, at one time, visit Mt. Sinai when His Kingdom was instituted, and it is most reasonable, aside from the Scripture intimations, to believe that when it will be gloriously reorganized with the Son of Man at its head, that He will again manifest Himself, as predicted, in the same place. We deem it not a little significant that a number of highly interesting works (like Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*) have recently been published calling special attention to Sinai. Hence we reject Thomas's (*Exp. of Dan.* p. 16), view that the Ancient of Days is equivalent to the Coming of Jesus (see Prop. 83), and Smith's (*Thoughts on Dan.*, p. 71), idea that the scene of investiture is in the third heaven. Whatever the right, exaltation, etc., of Jesus, we must keep in mind that this predicted, is a special inauguration scene visibly exhibited to the saints at the restoration. (Wild, *Ten Lost Tribes*, p. 156, has the *wildest* conception, when he makes the two witnesses of Rev. to be the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man—the former being Moses and the latter Elijah !)

[2] This subject may also throw light on such passages as 1 Thess. 5 : 1-5, " But ye brethren are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief," etc. Consider that this was addressed to Thessalonian brethren and includes them. Now if they are thus raised up, brought to Mt. Sinai, and made part of that reorganization, preliminary to the terrible scenes following, and even with Christ participate in them—will it not be pre-eminently true that being the acknowledged " *children of the day*" they cannot possibly be " in darkness." Again, the Passover is only partly fulfilled, the Lamb has been slain, the eating of its flesh in faith has been going on for centuries (showing forth His death until He come), but the Passover itself we are told by Jesus (Luke 22 : 15, 16), is to be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. In this Sinaitic arrangement, preparatory to " the day of vengeance," Jesus the mighty King will indeed be a refuge, etc., and no evil will befall them. The reader can find for himself other references to this period of deliverance from incoming judgments, all indicative of a visible manifestation and ordering in behalf of the covenanted Theocratic Kingdom.

Obs. 7. Other intimations are to be found, which, owing to their obscurity, have greatly perplexed critics. Let the student carefully examine the structure of Isa. 16 : 1–5, and it is self-evident, however we may give it an inchoate fulfilment, or make it typical, that it has not yet been fulfilled, seeing that in the immediate connection (v. 5) the throne is to be established, the Ruler is to sit upon it in the Kingdom of David, producing righteousness by His reign, which has not yet been verified. Seiss (*Apoc.*, Sec. 10, p. 282, footnote) corrects our version (which reads : " Send ye the Lamb to the Ruler of the land from Sela to the wilderness, unto the mount of the daughter of Zion") by giving, as the Vulgate, Luther, and other translations, the following : " Send ye (or, I will send) the Lamb, the Ruler of the land, *from Sela of the wilderness* unto the

mount of the daughter of Zion." The Chaldees makes it allude to "the Messiah, the Anointed of Israel." This, with the hiding of certain ones, the overthrow of the oppressor, the establishment of the Kingdom of David with the Ruler (after He has come "*from Sela of the wilderness*" to Jerusalem) reigning in it makes it to coincide with the other Scripture adduced. The Lamb is put for Jesus Christ, and the Word fully indentifies, in the future Coming of the Lamb, in His wrath, His marriage, His war, His throne, etc. (comp. Apoc.), this Lambhood with the Rulership that He shall exert over all the earth from the established throne and Kingdom of David.

Attention is invited to a passage, upon which a variety of opinion has been expressed, and which, perhaps, no one can confidently interpret, excepting as general analogy sustains, viz., Isa., ch. 41, and the connected chapters. Who is this "righteous man from the East?" Let any one look at the majesty, power, and glory declared of him, at the numerous promises descriptive of the same applied directly to the Messiah at His future Coming, at the Spirit's application of portions of the prediction expressly to Christ, and we are forced to the conclusion that the usual reference of this "righteous man" to Abraham or to Cyrus is utterly untenable—although, as some do, we make Abraham or Cyrus merely typical of the Christ, having a double fulfilment, etc. The trouble with interpreters is that they cannot explain how this "righteous man," if Jesus, comes "*from the East.*" But we have to bear in mind that the term "East" (see e.g. Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 230, *Encyc. R. Knowl.*, art. "East," etc.) has a wide range, and is applicable to Arabia Deserta, Idumea, etc., from whence Jesus comes, as we have pointed out. Hence the applicability of these predictions to Jesus, as the ancients held (e.g. Barnabas, Tertullian, Augustine, etc.), can be received in every particular. As the approach of Jesus and His saints will follow the route of the Israelites, and hence the coming to Jerusalem will be literally from the East, it is well to notice that Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 167) pronounces the approach from Jericho and Bethany to be "really grand." It is the very route taken in the triumphal entry of the Gospels, and indicative of this future triumphal entry. Stanley (p. 315) quotes Palmer as saying, "From the Castle of Rubad, north of the Jabkok, are distinctly visible Lebanon, the Sea of Galilee, Esdraelon in its fullest extent, Carmel, the Mediterranean, and the whole range of Judah and Ephraim. It is *the finest view* that I ever saw in any part of the world." We may add, that this view may be used as confirmatory of Fausset's (*Chr. Herald*, Aug. 14th, 1879), respecting the "Kings from the East" (Rev. 16) viz., to be "Christ's transfigured saints returning from the East to reign as king priests with Him (Isa. 40 : 3 ; Ezek. 43 : 2 ; Zech. 14 : 4, 5 ; Rev. 1 : 6, and 19 : 8, 13, 14). Babylon must fall, that Jerusalem, literal and spiritual, may rise. 'The kings of the earth' (Rev. 16 : 14) shall be superseded by the Lord from heaven and 'the kings of (from) the East' with Him (Ezek. 21 : 27)."

Obs. 8. This removal to Mt. Sinai, and the union there consummated of Theocratic relationship (likened owing to its intimate, enduring, and permanent character, to a marriage), satisfactorily explains some allusions to the future marriage, which many writers ignore or fail to conciliate. Notice : In Matt. 25 : 1, the Bridegroom is Coming and the invited ones who are watching go with Him to the marriage, the rest being left ; in Luke 12 : 36, the exhortation is to wait for the Lord "*when He will return from the wedding ;*" in Rev. 19 a marriage is announced *preceding* this overthrow of Antichrist ; in Rev. 21, a marriage follows the removal of God's enemies. And how reconcile the exhortation to watch for the Bridegroom Coming *to* the wedding and the warning to watch for Him Coming *from* the wedding, and both these with Rev. ? If we keep in view how (as explained Props. 118 and 169), the figure of the marriage relation is employed to denote a variety of unions, and then notice this Theocratic union formed at Mt. Sinai *previous* to the open Advent of Jesus and His saints, and *previous* (as was observed e.g. Prop. 130, and Obs. 4) to the

overthrow of the Antichristian powers, we have *the key* of an easy solution. The one (Matt.) refers to the thief-like Coming followed by the union at Mt. Sinai; the other (Luke) to the Coming of the Lord *after* this union at Mt. Sinai (likened to a marriage) and specially addressed to Jews and others; the one (Rev. 19), refers to the union at Mt. Sinai, and is the same explained under "the married wife" Prop. 118; the other (Rev. 21) follows the overthrow of Antichrist, and is the union delineated under Prop. 169. Thus several phases in the Sec. Advent, with respective unions entered into, are presented before us; the reconcilation being found complete in the order as presented to us.

The fact is, it helps us to see how a number of things, which must transpire before the open Advent, can take place. Thus e.g. *how and where* the judgment of believers is consummated, so that their respective stations in the Kingdom are assigned (Prop. 135). It teaches us that that special preparedness for the direct establishment of the Kingdom is of a supernatural nature, and done under the divine auspices at Mt. Sinai, and hence we cannot possibly receive the suppositions e.g. of the Catholic Apostolic Church that it, through the Apostolate established, is doing this work, or of Mormonism that it by its system, etc., is performing it. It evinces that Jesus, in more aspects than is generally supposed, is a "*Prophet like unto Moses.*" It shows that in the great work specially delegated to Moses, for which he was particularly commissioned by the Almighty, viz., to erect and organize a Theocratic government, *in this Jesus will follow his footsteps,* and evidence the same work, only on a grander scale. The non-repentance of the Jewish nation, its rejection of the Messiah, caused the postponement of this, the mighty work, to the Sec. Advent; *then* will it be performed, and in *the identical place,* too, where Moses stood forth the head of the nation. The *supernatural,* which necessarily accompanied the setting up of a Theocracy (which unbelief rejects as unworthy of credence, although the absence of it would vitiate *the Theocratic idea*), will again be manifested in the gathering of the people; in the august inauguration; in the march to Palestine; in the encounter with the enemies of the Theocracy; in the establishment at Jerusalem, and in the advancement and progress of its power over the nations of the earth. The investiture of the Sovereignty of the world is *so magnificent* a feature that it justly, in view of its magnitude, design, the worthiness of the person invested, etc., demands *a manifestation of it here on earth,* and this it receives at Mt. Sinai, where again a scene will be enacted, which will present *an overwhelming sense* of the majesty, power, and glory of the Ruler. But in the reinauguration there will be this great difference, that while the saints will undoubtedly be deeply affected by the wonderful transactions going on—while profoundly moved at the sublimity of the investiture, yet they will not be affected by fear, as the Jewish nation, and pray that the glorious manifestations may cease, for prepared by previous glorification for this service, and realizing their dearest Friend in the person of the Ruler, they have, as Paul says, "*boldness in the day of judgment;*" for the scene before them, and in which they participate, is not one of death, as the Jews apprehended, but one of *salvation, joy, blessedness, and glory.* When the covenants are so vividly remembered and exalted by fulfilment, then such Psls. as the 98th will be verified. Then will be fulfilled the saying of Cummings: "The world's greatest tribulation is the hour of the Christian's most magnificent deliverance." When the year of the redeemed and the day of vengeance *both* come, Jesus, the Theocratic King, will be glorified and admired by His own (Isa. 63 comp. with 2 Thess. 1 : 5–9). The Theocracy is established over "*a willing people,*" who will exult and rejoice with fulness of joy in their King and Redeemer. Vengeance does not touch the saints; and when Jesus appears "a polished shaft hid in God's quiver" (Isa. 49 : 2), "in whom God will be glorified" when employed against His enemies, these saints themselves, by association of rulership and Theocratic power conferred on this "mount of God," shall participate in its execution, Ps. 149 : 6–9; Rev. 2 : 26, 27, etc.

PROPOSITION 167. *The re-establishment of this Kingdom embraces also the reception of a New Revelation of the Divine Will.*

This *necessarily* results, for while the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom is restored, its restoration is accompanied by great and wonderful changes. The inaugurated rule of the Theocratic King, as predicted, the participation of the saints in such rule, the world-wide extent of the Kingdom, the supremacy of the Jewish nation, the entering upon a new age or dispensation, the change that will result in the condition of believers in this Kingdom, etc., *calls for a revelation* by which not only the official position of the saints is to be governed, but that of the Jewish and Gentile nations is to be controlled.

We have only to ponder the Theocratic idea embraced in the reign of Jesus and His saints, and the reasonableness of our Prop. at once appears. We cannot possibly conceive of a restored Theocracy with the extraordinary changes predicted, without increased Revelation as a directory to rulers and subjects.

Obs. 1. The reader will observe that our entire argument insists upon the present and continued sufficiency of Revelation down to the Sec. Advent, over against St. Simonians, Friends of Light, Swedenborgians, Mystics, Mormons, Spiritualists, etc. The Scriptures, as we now have them, are not only the highest but the last Revelation down to that period ; and, hence, we reject all others, no matter by whom presented or by what argument enforced. *Until* the arrival of the Bridegroom, there is *a sufficiency* given to gather out and guide the elect. Nothing is lacking to meet the Divine Purpose respecting this dispensation, either in the way of instruction, motive, encouragement, etc. ; and, therefore, it is unreasonable to anticipate another Revelation *until* we enter another and more glorious dispensation. Our position protects us against all vagaries, all pretended Revelations, on the one hand, and likewise against that assumed by some few, viz., that they are called upon to organize a Theocratic Society similar to the Mosaic and amalgamate Mosaic and Christian ordinances, etc. We gratefully *accept* of the apostolic arrangements for our present good, and *await* the arrival of Him, the Christ, *who alone* has the authority to institute the changes deemed necessary. Before we are enticed into any of the schemes which so largely prevail under the garb of piety, zeal, increased knowledge, bestowed gifts of the Spirit, etc., we are content to "occupy" with the things that are *legitimately* given to us *until* He, the King, comes.

Emerson once declared, "the need was never greater of a new revelation than now ;" we, from our standpoint, would say the need was never greater of returning to the Revelation already given than now. We have no sympathy whatever for pretended

revelations given by professed prophets and prophetesses, or drawn from a professed "inner light," etc. Our position has been fully set forth under Props. 9 and 10.

Obs. 2. The Theocracy under David's Son and Lord, being God's own ordering, will embrace in some *formal manner* God's Will in regard to it. Thus, e.g. the assignment of the positions in the coming Kingdom, as intimated by Jesus, Matt. 20 : 23, will call forth *an expression* of the Divine pleasure. The entire structure of the Millennial predictions or prophecies pertaining to this Kingdom, *assume or intimate* such a Revelation. In Isa. 2, and Micah 4, (which refer, as we have shown, to this period), it is said that in that day, "*out of Zion shall go forth the law and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem;*" in various predictions (as e.g. Zech. 14 : 16, etc.) the nations shall send their representatives to Jerusalem, to ascertain and perform *the Will* of the King; in that dispensation so largely shall the Spirit be poured out that many shall *prophesy* Joel 2 : 28, 29 (comp. Prop. 171); at that time the Lord shall instruct, so that "*all thy children shall be taught of the Lord,*" Isa. 54 : 13, filling the earth with *the knowledge* of the Lord Isa. 11 : 9; in Ps. 68 : 11 (which, Prop. 166, also is fulfilled at this time) it is said: "*The Lord gave the Word: great was the company (or Heb. army) of those that published it;*" in brief, so permeated are the promises pertaining to this era with the idea that God shall then specially and more abundantly *reveal His Will*, that it is made the matter of praise and rejoicing. The saints who inherit this Kingdom, i.e. are rulers in it, are designated as *Priests*, whose office can only be explained by referring it chiefly to an official position (Prop. 156) in which they make known the Will of God. The removal of darkness, the closing of the mystery of God, the impartation of perfect knowledge, the bestowal of "a pure language," etc., is indicative of the same, and is fully implied in the tabernacling of God again with man, etc., in Rev., chs. 21 and 22.

A little observation can extend such references, as e.g. in Ps. 138 : 4, "*All the kings of the earth shall praise Thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of Thy mouth.*" Now down to the Sec. Advent this is not fulfilled (for the kings of the earth even at the Advent are arrayed against Christ), but when "the kings" associated with Christ (Prop. 154) shall reign over the earth *then* when Christ gives His "words"—the Revelation of His will, etc., "all," without exception shall praise Him. Numerous Propositions indicative of the reign and priesthood of Jesus and His saints, the restoration of the Jews, the nature of the Theocratic Kingdom, etc., all evidence that in "the ages" to come, God's will, as circumstances require, shall be expressed and gloriously advanced.

Obs. 3. The Revelation respecting the Theocratic ordering, (viz., the manner of organization, etc.) originally was given outside of Palestine at Mt. Sinai. So also the special Revelation concerning the restored Theocratic arrangement will again be given at Mt. Sinai (See Prop. 166).

Christlieb (*Mod. Doubt*, p. 133), in his ch. on the relation between Reason and Revelation, after illustrating the aid Revelation gives to reason by the telescope assisting the naked eye in the study of astronomy, and that still *lacunæ* exist which involve no contradiction, then adds: "Revelation and nature are developing toward one great goal at which they will coalesce. The perfecting of the one is that of the other. The fixed tendency of Revelation to become nature, to make itself more and more a citizen of earth in order to make the earth the chosen place of divine Revelation, this tendency is one day *to be completely realized;* the consummated Kingdom of God will combine both elements; the highest degree of Revelation and the highest development of nature." This necessarily follows from this instituted Theocracy, for the King revealing Himself

openly, Revelation in its highest form is manifested. The restitution brings with it that nearness and access to God, which was forfeited by the fall. The Baptism of the Holy Spirit (see Prop. 171) imparts to each king and priest the power of giving knowledge received by special influences. Bickersteth (*Divine Warning*, p. 316), thinks, that the kings and priests shall, like the old prophets, present at times "oral revelation." Although this idea is ridiculed by Dr. Brown and others, yet, in view of their station, gifts, etc., there is nothing incredible in the statement. But Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 112), while endeavoring to rebut the idea of a new Revelation of the Divine Will, suitable for the age to come, concedes this: "Who can fail to see that a new dispensation *necessarily implies a new Revelation* to usher it in; in other words to *authorize and organize it.*" Precisely so; and hence the question to be decided is whether a dispensation is to follow this one. Our entire line of argument conclusively proves that this will be the result. Brown in the same work largely employs as an argument against us, our inability to explain satisfactorily or decisively certain details respecting the Mill. Age (as e.g. if the righteous Jews, etc., are translated, or whether they die, and if so, when resurrected, etc.). We inform such that we await the future Revelation to embody the details and believe that if such were now given in connection with the outlines, they would meet *the same fate* precisely at the hands of unbelief and captious critics as the more essential.

Obs. 4. This feature enables us to meet an objection urged by some against our view, viz., that Revelation as now existing, would not be adapted (as e.g. in its requirements) to such an age and kingdom as we advocate. This is freely admitted; for Revelation as now given *only* brings us down to the restitution of things under Christ, and *when* the forfeited blessings are restored, *then*, of course, another Revelation of the will of God *pertaining to the order of that age* is to be anticipated. Now the condition thus future is only expressed in the most general terms; now the Bible appropriately begins with the fall and ends with the rescue, without giving a detailed account of "*the world to come*" in its governmental, civil, and religious aspect; *then* the fulfilment of those general statements will require specific orderings, and *then* the developments of that age will demand, to carry it out, a more extended Revelation of the Divine Purpose, both in its administrations and dispositions, and in the end which it is to subserve. The reason why such details are not now given is not merely because it would be *premature and unnecessary*, but evidently, judging from the sad perversion of that already given, to avoid its being *grossly misapplied*, and even *caricatured* by the most shabby imitations.

We sometimes read authors who assume, so far as the early Church is concerned, as if the Montanists alone believed in a future new Revelation. The Millenarianism so prevalent in the Primitive Church led the Fathers, as Papias, Barnabas, Justin, etc., to hold to additional Revelation only at the Sec. Advent, while Montanists and some others allowed antecedent Revelation; and, if we are to credit history as given, some enthusiasts even then claimed to be inspired to impart Revelation.

PROPOSITION 168. *This Kingdom has its place of manifested royalty.*

If the Kingdom is such a Theocratic-Davidic one *here on earth;* if it claims the Throne and Kingdom of David as its *central basis;* and if this Throne and Kingdom is, as promised, *to be re-established; then*, if the reign of David's Son is described, there should be undoubted references to His reigning in the place, and exhibiting His royalty in the very place *where* David's throne was located, viz., *in Jerusalem.*

Obs. 1. This has already been largely met in showing how David's Son inherits the throne, the Kingdom, and the land (see Props. 49 and 122); but the prophets are even more explicit in particularizing the place of manifestation. Leaving the New Jerusalem and its connection with the earthly for future notice (*see Prop.* 169), attention is now only called to that class of passages which predict that the Christ shall reign *in Jerusalem and on Mt. Zion.* Thus, e.g. just at the time "the high ones" and "the kings of the earth" are punished (comp. Rev. 19, etc.), and "gathered in the pit and shut up in the prison," *then* also "the Lord of hosts shall reign *in Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem*, and before His ancients gloriously," Isa. 24 : 23. So also Jer. 3 : 17, Joel 3 : 17, Zech. 2 : 10–13, etc., for, as all admit, the references to the Christ reigning in Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem are numerous. But in the application of these passages we are met, at the start, with the objection, that they are typical, or figurative, of something else, either of the Church, visible or invisible, or of the Gospel, or of God's reign in the heart, or of heaven. Aside from the arguments already presented which amply answer this objection, there is another provided by the Spirit, and, in a way too, that certainly should arrest attention. Briefly stated, it is this: the *very same* Jerusalem that was overthrown, and made desolate and oppressed, is *the one* to which this Jesus comes and in which He is to reign. The proof is decisive. Take e.g. Zech 8, when the Lord will be "*jealous for Zion*" with "*great fury,*" when He will "*return unto Zion and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem shall be called, a City of Truth: and the Mountain of the Lord of Hosts, the Holy Mountain.*" That *the earthly* Jerusalem is denoted follows, not only from the affirmation of *a restoration* of the Jews to it, and an astonishing multiplication and longevity of the people in it (designated as "marvellous,") but in verse 13, 15, 22 this is designated as the *identical* Jerusalem once deprived of its inhabitants and suffering ill, so that God says: "*as I thought to punish you when your fathers provoked me to wrath, saith the Lord of Hosts, and I repented not: so again have I thought in these days* (i.e. when He returns and dwells in Jerusalem) *to do well unto Jerusalem,*" etc. Or, let this same prophet speak in the 14th.

ch., and *the same* Jerusalem overthrown is *the one* to which the Lord and the saints will come; in which, *after* it is restored and exalted, the Lord is King, for the nations come to it to worship Him, and tender their allegiance. The Lord "*shall choose Jerusalem again.*" The same contrast is preserved in Micah 3 and 4. For the *identical* Zion that was "ploughed as a field" and *the same* Jerusalem that "became heaps," is to be re-established and exalted, and "*the Lord shall reign in Mt. Zion from henceforth, even forever.*" Isaiah frequently represents this, as e.g. in chs. 1 : 1–26, 4 : 3, 4; 60 : 14, 15; 62 : 1–4; 65 : 19, etc., and in view of such plain statements that *the place* from whence God withdrew, and which met with sore, heavy, prolonged disasters should be restored and elevated into the very position assigned to it by a solemnly given covenant, it does appear a matter of amazement that learned men should close their eyes *to this constant reiteration and its meaning.* The "babes" (so esteemed by many) of the early Church verify Matt. 11 : 25 and 21 : 16, for they received with faith the plain covenant promises, and did not believe what wise men now so confidently assert, that the prophets and ancient worthies grossly misapprehended the predictions of God and walked in darkness respecting Messiah's inheritance and Kingdom. No! they placed "*the thrones of the house of David*" (Ps. 122 : 5, Isa. 2 : 3, etc.) where God has ordained them, viz. *in Jerusalem;* and they trusted that "*the Lord doth build up Jerusalem,*" Ps. 147 : 2, and that when He "*redeems Jerusalem,*" causing *the* "*waste places of Jerusalem*" *to* "*break forth into joy,*" it is (Isa. 52 : 9, 10) because "*the Lord hath made bare His holy arm in the eyes of all nations, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.*" God's faithfulness and honor is *pledged* in this matter; and, therefore, *we also hope* in Him to see "*Jerusalem comforted*" in the abundance of God's people in her, and in the worship, praise, and glory that shall yet be witnessed there.

It would, indeed, be a mere frittering away of God's promises to limit them to the past. It will yet come to pass as God has sworn Num. 14 : 21, "*But as truly as I live, all the earth*" (Clarke : *all the land,* i.e. *land of Canaan*) "*shall be filled with the glory of the Lord.*" What Sir Maundeville says in the prologue to his *Travels,* will yet be acknowledged in a higher and nobler sense : "The Holy Land, which men call the land of promise or behest, passing all other lands, is the most worthy land, most excellent, and lady, and sovereign of all other lands," "the heart and the middle of the world," etc. The student is reminded of the central position of Palestine. Mohammed, Pope Urban, and many others, have asserted, in view of its geographical position, that Jerusalem was "placed in the very centre of the world." This is pushing the matter to an extreme, although all admit the admirable central location of the land, easily accessible from all sides, etc., placing it as Kurtz (*Sac. His.,* p. 65), remarks, "in the centre of the activity of the world." This same writer (*His. Old Cov.,* vol. 1, p. 147), says : "Viewed geographically, politically, or commercially, Palestine is the 'umbillicus terrarum' of the ancient world," etc. (and on p. 148, he refers to Ezek. 5 : 5—comp. Lam. 2 : 15—as an allusion to the central situation of the land of promise, and defends it against Calvin and Hävernick who regarded it as a Rabbinical fancy. Theodoret and others, favor Kurtz's position. However this may be in reference to particular passages, it certainly is plain to every reader that the situation of the land is such as to make it, geographically, the most suitable for the Divine Purpose relating to the future (comp. Props. 169, 122, etc.). Comp. for central position of Palestine, Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine,* p. 116 (he also refers to the old mediæval maps), Reland's *Palestine,* ch. 10, p. 52 (who quotes Jerome, Theodoret, and Kimchi), Warner's *In the Levant* (who refers to an actual centre as exhibited by superstition in the Greek and Armenian chapels at Jerusalem, an imitation perhaps of the centre in the Kaaba at Mecca), and Bish. Arnulf's *Travels* (about A.D. 700), who p. 3, speaks of Jerusalem being "the centre of the earth," the geographical idea being, through a popular notion, founded on Ps. 74 : 12. So Lange's *Com. Gen.,* Herzog's *Ency.,* art. Palestine, Kitto, Thompson, Coleman, etc.

Obs. 2. This Kingdom *follows* an overthrow of Jerusalem, and is *identified with its restoration.* By merely observing the former, multitudes have made a mistake, constituting the Church the Kingdom and the Church a Jerusalem. But such forget what the prophets unitedly testify, that the Messiah's Kingdom *cannot possibly exist here on earth while the city the special inheritance of David's Son, lies desolate.* The covenant and Millennial descriptions *positively* forbid it, and *demand its restoration* as the seat of the Theocratic-Davidic government. The Kingdom then and a contemporaneous desolation of Jerusalem, is in the very nature of the case, impracticable. Yet, as Olshausen and numerous writers have remarked, in Matt. 24, etc., the Kingdom follows the destruction of Jerusalem, and fixing the attention only on the destruction of the city by the Romans in the first cent., great perplexity is felt in showing *how* this was accomplished unless the Church is admitted to be the promised Messiah's Kingdom. To-day it is an exegetical question of importance (Van Oosterzee, *Theol. N. T.*, p. 121, Schmid, *Bib. Theol. N. T.*, p. 265, etc.) why Christ associates the last times, the ending of the age or dispensation *with* the destruction of Jerusalem. If we allow the prophecies to throw light on the subject the question is *easily* answered. 1. The predictions of Christ directly teach *a long continued* destruction and desolation of Jerusalem, viz., that it shall be trodden down *during the times* of the Gentiles. This is still in the course of fulfilment. 2. When the times of the Gentiles *end* it shall be restored. 3. But during this allotted, appointed period the city is in a sadly reduced condition, in the hands of the Gentiles. 4. Now, if we turn to other predictions it is declared that Jerusalem *just previous* to the Sec. Advent of Christ—also embraced by Matt. Mark and Luke—shall experience in a remarkable manner the animosity (after a partial return of Jews to the city, probably under the auspices of some nation, or from love to it, or desire to restore and elevate it) of Gentile nations. 5. This last adverse *is part* of the imposed tribulation; and it is *only* when this is accomplished that the open Advent occurs, and the Kingdom is established. 6. This is satisfactorily presented in Zech. 14, taken in connection with Christ's prophecy. For, after the times of the Gentiles have nearly run their course, *just before the end of it*, the gathering of the nations against Jerusalem, described by the prophet takes place—an event very different from that under the Romans, as *the subsequent occurrences* show. Just when the city is at the last extremity, God interferes, the Saviour comes *to this very city*, the saints come with Him, His Kingship is manifested over the earth, Jerusalem is the metropolis of His power, etc. 6. It is true then, that the Personal Advent is connected *with* the destruction of Jerusalem, but not with that under the Romans, or other Gentile powers *until* we come to the period when it shall, still under Gentile domination as the closing scene proves, come to a final end. Then, as our whole argument involves, He comes as the prophets describe.

The extremes of various parties are easily avoided by simply allowing a comparison of predictions to give us the order of fulfilment. Thus, on the one hand, those (as e.g. Jowett, *Com.* 1 *Thess.*) who make the prophecies a failure because not realized at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, overlook the association of the same with "the times of the Gentiles." On the other hand, those who, like the Perfectionists (Art. 28 of their Confessions, quoted in *Oberlin Quart. Review*, May, 1847), declare, "We believe that at the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the Jewish dispensation, Christ came to believers *the second time* according to promise," spiritualize and pervert the Sec. Advent to suit their notion of chronological connection. Jerusalem, so long oppressed, will yet drink the dregs

of the bitter cup, and then she will arise in glory at the Coming of her Redeemer and King. Terribly punished for rejecting the Messiah, that same Messiah will comfort and raise her up to a state of splendor and majesty most magnificent. Clarke (*Com., Zech.* 14) says: "After this final restoration of Jerusalem, it shall never more be destroyed; but as it was the first city of the living God upon earth, so it shall be the last; it shall be safely inhabited. It shall see war no more." Its Theocratic relationship will, of necessity, exalt it above every other city in the world, and ever preserve it from evil. What thoughts must have filled the mind of this King when, with His knowledge of the future, He walked the streets of the city destined to such long-continued downtreading and then to such honor and glory.

Obs. 3. Perhaps the reason why Jerusalem itself fell into the hands of unbelievers, and remained but a brief period in the power of professed Christians at the time of the Crusades, was to prevent the laudatory and extravagant expressions respecting the supposed set up Kingdom of God, and to avoid the false inferences respecting the fulfilment of prophecy, arising from a possession of the city. Let the reader recall the eulogies passed by flatterers on the Emperors and the Empress Helena that adorned the city, and that the city itself was called "the New Jerusalem." Let him consider the expectations excited in Popes and others at its possession, the feeling evidenced to some extent in Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*, and the believer in Divine Providence will feel that the failure of Christian nations, after fearful struggle, to secure Jerusalem, *lies deeper* than mere history records; in brief, not only a desire to vindicate and fulfil prophecy, but even to remove the impediments to an understanding of the Word that would inevitably have arisen if Jerusalem would have become a noted Christian city, prevailed in this marshalling of hostile races around the ancient city of God.

But this very denial of possession causes men to spiritualize the more, looking for no special external prosperity. Thus e.g. Ralston (*On the Apoc.*, p. 191), in his arbitrary arrangement of the Millennium (for example, introducing into it four trumpets, the two witnesses, etc.), apologizes for bringing into it his witnesses *in sackcloth*, making it indicative of humility, and then adds: "The Millennial day will be distinguished for gracious gifts, for devotedness, for humility and every concomitant virtue; but they who anticipate worldly magnificence will likely be mistaken. The Pagan tale of *a golden age* and the Jewish tradition of *a temporal Messiah* were never realized. And it is truly painful to hear the idle fancies of the present generation, in associating temporal splendor with the spiritual blessings of the future time." This writer is only pained because his Mill. theory is rejected by others, who feel that the predicted splendor of the Theocracy, of the King and rulers, of the New Jerusalem, of the earthly Jerusalem, of a world-dominion, etc., is utterly opposed to a sackcloth and martyr Millennium.

Obs. 4. Indeed, it would be difficult to identify this earthly Jerusalem more decisively than God has done. In Ezek. 16, Jerusalem is personified under the figure of a woman, taken when a child, and finally married, i.e. most intimately related to God. As if to meet the very mistake now so current, even among theologians, of changing this into the Church, etc., it is said that her habitation is "*the land of Canaan*," that her "*father was an Amorite*" and her "*mother a Hittite*" (a parentage that cannot be given to the Church), and then after describing her adulteries, her prolonged punishments, God still professes that He will remember "*His Covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant.*" That is, *the same* Jerusalem joined to God *in a Theocratic relationship*, severely punished for her sins, *shall again* be restored to this relationship under the surety afforded by the covenant.

When the covenant is, *after long delay,* finally realized, Isa. 26 : 1, "*in that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah; We have a strong city,*" etc. It shall become "*the city of righteousness, the faithful city,*" Isa. 1 : 26, "*A city of truth and the Mountain of the Lord of hosts, the Holy Mountain.*" This last expression, the city, owing to its being the capital, etc., called "the mountain" opens a field of references to the student corroborating our view of "*the city of habitation*" (Ps. 107) into which go "the redeemed of the Lord," yea those "He hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy," when they are "gathered from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south," being "brought out of darkness and the shadow of death." The removal of the wicked out of the land that "*wicked doers may be cut off from the city of the Lord,*" Ps. 101 : 8 (as delineated in Ps. 48 : compared with other Scripture, when "kings are assembled" against "*the city of the great King,*" but meet with a terrible overthrow), also confirms our doctrine. If we take any other view, then we make the prayers (Isa. 62 : 6, 7) of the ancient saints for, the longings and hopes inspired by the promises relating to, Jerusalem merely great blunders; and God, Himself, the Truth, becomes chargeable with misleading the most holy of desires, on the ground that the language, as all admit, in its natural, grammatical sense *plainly leads* to the hope of a literal restoration of "*the beloved city.*" If the prevailing view is the correct one, *then consistency* requires, that Origen, with inspired credentials, ought immediately to have followed the giving of the covenants, so that man might have apprehended them.

It is noticeable that even writers who advocate a spiritual Millennium, seeing the prominence given to this point in the Scriptures, conclude that at some future time Christianity will obtain the sway in Palestine, and the holy land will play an important part in the world's history. The early Church view on this subject has been repeatedly given, and may be reproduced in John Bunyan's faith (Conf. of Faith presented to Charles II., A.D. 1660, see Crosby's *His. of Baptists*) that "at or after His Coming the second time, He will not only raise the dead, and judge and restore the world, but will also take to Himself His Kingdom, and will, according to the Scriptures, reign *on the throne of His father David, on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, forever.*" Of course Millenarians, ancient and modern, indorse this view as essential to the complete fulfilment of covenant promise. We even find Dr. Chalmers (*Posth. Works,* vol. 3, p. 69, On Ps. 68 : 18, 35) saying : "But God has in reserve for His people still another restoration. He will bring them again, as of old, from Bashan and the Red Sea to their own land. His people will 'see Him whom they have pierced,' perhaps when His feet stand on the Mount of Olives, and *Jerusalem will again become the great central sanctuary, by becoming the metropolis of the Christian world.*" Many old works clearly present this faith. Thus e.g. Richter's *Erklärte Haus Bibel,* tom. 6, p. 1134, after dwelling on the first res. and the reign of the saints on earth, says : "Jerusalem shall again be the central city of the Kingdom of Christ, during the 1000 years, as it is so often promised in the Old Test." The faith of the early Church, as given by Justin and others (quoted by us under preceding Props.) on this point, has been entertained by many noble believers.

Obs. 5. The most bitter of our opponents, who on this very ground also reject a large portion of the Scriptures, frankly admit the teaching of holy men in this respect. Thus, e.g. *Westm. Review,* Oct. 1861, art. 5, declares that the Apoc. asserts that "the great battle which is to determine whether the monarchy of the world shall be Christ's or Antichrist's is fought within the circle of his (John's) native hills, and the conquering King, during His Mill. reign, *has the metropolis of the old Hebrew princes,* endeared by a thousand glorious memories, *for His imperial residence.*" The same is repeated by numerous writers, evincing how the language

itself arrests unbelievers, and, in consequence, leaving them inexcusable in rejecting the truth as given. The same objections urged against the incarnation of Christ, the life and death of Jesus, are also presented against this doctrine, not one of them daring to look at *the foundation* of all this in the covenant, and, at the general agreement of centuries of Revelation on the subject.

Now, aside from the close and most intimate connection of the New Jerusalem with the Old (comp. Prop. 169), the student will see abundant reason why Jerusalem (the earthly) should thus again be elevated (as Justin Martyr said, "rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others do unanimously attest") as *the central, metropolitan city.* Its relationship to the Theocracy, which must have some place of royal manifestation; its elective privilege, being divinely chosen and desired as the place of royal abode; its immediate and abiding connection with the elect nation and its predicted supremacy—all show *why* it is thus exalted. If God again (as He has promised) condescends to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler (which He will do in the Person of His Son Jesus, as predicted), He most certainly will select Jerusalem, where He once thus ruled, and show that *a Theocracy*, such as He inaugurated there, is no failure. The predictions, therefore, on the subject are not only plain, but the most reasonable for us to receive. Rome has proudly in the past arrogated to itself the title of "The Capital of the World" (even depicted on coins, e.g. Gibbon's *Decl. and Fall*, vol. 6, p. 437), which became an intoxicating dream of scheming Popes, but this title, according to God's Word, alone belongs to the despised and down-trodden city of Jerusalem, because it is *the Messiah's special inheritance.* As God disciplines and chastens man before He elevates him to kingship, as the Messiah Himself passed through humiliation and suffering before His exaltation, so also the city destined to such high distinction and grandeur passes through its allotted period of depression and tribulation.

Obs. 6. The student is reminded that if the Ch. Church is to be comprehended under Mt. Zion, it is singular that Mt. Moriah where the temple stood, and the highest religious worship was exhibited, was not substituted, by the prophets, for Mt. Zion. *Why* should Zion have this peculiar and distinctive preference over Moriah? The answer is found in *the covenanted relation* of Zion, as the place where the Messiah, David's Son should reign. If these things are merely typical, as our opponents allege, why this careful avoidance of Moriah? The reply is, that these promises are not typical but blessed realities, to be verified at the Second Advent. God, foreseeing the lack of faith induced by the prevailing spiritualistic typical application, leaves it utterly inexcusable by the uniform utterances on the subject, combined with circumstances (as we have shown) which cannot possibly be applied to the present Church. Simple faith in God's promises should prevent the substitutions which are to-day offered in place of Mt. Zion and Jerusalem.

We give a few illustrations. Brown (*Ch. Sec. Com.*, p. 370), in reply to Dr. Bonar, says: "Ah! brother, never more shall Jerusalem be 'the city of the great King,' the place of Jehovah's special presence and power, grace and glory, in connection with ceremonial worship. 'In Salem was his tabernacle and his dwelling place in Zion' (Ps. 76:1). But by the work of Christ these localities are stripped forever of their ceremonial sacredness. 'Salem' and 'Zion' are now in every place where 'the Father is worshipped in spirit and in truth.'" Well may we ask then, why predict *their restoration* in connection with Messiah's glorious reign and *the restoration* of the Jewish nation, when "the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled?" No! Dr. Bonar's position is founded on *an oath-bound covenant*, and confirmed by the plainest of predictions. Moreover, this very worshipping of the Father "in spirit and in truth" everywhere, which Brown considers so antagonistic to the restoration of these places, is *one of the grand characteristics* of the Mill. age and the Messiah's reign on David's throne, for all nations shall yield obedience, and God's worship be tendered everywhere, etc. Again: the Mormons hold (Jos. Smith in his *History of the Latter-Day Saints*, Rupp's *Orig. His. of Relig. Denom.*, p. 410)

"that Zion will be built upon this continent"—a work in which they are now engaged at Salt Lake City; which, foolish as it may sound, is on a par with Dr. Berg and others, making the Fifth Universal Monarchy, of Daniel, to find its *centre* in the United States. Fanatics, in order to exalt their pretentions to authority and reverence, have at different times presented other places—where they happened to meet success—than the ones designated in Scripture, as Jerusalem or Mt. Zion. Some churches lay special claim to these titles, delighting to designate themselves as "Jerusalem" or "Zion," esteeming themselves thus particularly favored. This sad, sad perversion of covenant and prediction extensively prevails, and the wildest extravagances of scriptural interpretation springs from it. Even persons who have more or less sympathy with Chiliasm, expressing decided Pre-Mill. views, have so little studied the requirements of the Davidic oath-confirmed covenant, and of Christ's promised inheritance, that they allow mere fancy to be the interpreter. Thus e.g. Talmage, in a *Sermon* on Luke 9 : 55 (preached Jan. 25th, 1880, and contained in *The Ch. Herald*), places "the regeneration of the race on this (the American) continent," saying: "If Christ comes to reign on earth personally, as millions of good people anticipate, I think He will set up His throne somewhere between the Alleghanies and the Rocky Mountains; and I think He will walk the streets of our great American cities. Would that the heavens might open to-day, and that our Lord would descend to take possession of this continent. How we would rush out of our churches to greet Him, and by clanging bells and thundering cannonade, we would announce His arrival," etc. No covenant or prediction sustains such utterances. While Talmage and a few others might be disposed to thus greet the Messiah, the multitude would apprehend His coming with fear. Indeed, the vast majority of church-members, having vastly different views of a Messiah's Coming, and being influenced by the Whitbyan dream of conquest, peace, and safety, would reject such a Coming Messiah. Alas! the Church's position as predicted (see Prop. 177, etc.) is very different from the portraiture thus delineated. When our opponents can make Zion or Jerusalem to mean the Church in general, or an individual congregation, or a denomination, or religion, or the Gospel, or the third heaven at pleasure—when they can be made synonymous with American Republicanism (Baldwin's *Armageddon*, p. 33), etc., they are, of course, unprepared to accept of the meaning contained in the plain grammatical sense.

Obs. 7. How simple, child-like, but grand was the faith of the early persecuted Church in these promises of inheriting the earth! They believed God because He plainly promised, and with the hope inspired by such promises, laid down their lives for Jesus' sake. Thus, to illustrate the faith of the early martyrs, and to show how Scripturally it was founded, we quote Irenæus (the disciple of Polycarp, the pupil of St. John, and martyred about A.D. 203): "Thus, therefore, as God promised to Abraham *the inheritance of the earth*, and he received it not during the whole time he lived, it is necessary that he should receive it, together with his seed, that is, with such of them as fear God and believe in Him, *in the resurrection of the just*. . . . They will, *undoubtedly*, receive it at the res. of the just: for true and unchangeable is God; wherefore He also said, 'Blessed are the meek, *for they shall inherit the earth*.'" Surely, martyr faith thus expressed, ought at least, to secure the respect of believers. (*Comp. Prop.* 142.)

Greg (*The Creed of Christendom*) objects to the manner in which God is represented as revealing Himself, in appointing a special place where He might be enthroned, accessible, etc. He ridicules it as incompatible with the declaration "the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him," etc. But such fault-finding results from a total misapprehension of the nature of a Theocracy—as scripturally explained by us—which must, according to its fundamental idea (if God really rules as an earthly ruler over the Jewish nation), make the King personally accessible; and, therefore, to facilitate and honor His manifested Kingship, appropriate a place for that presence. The land thus favored becomes a "sanctuary" (so called, Ex. 15 : 17, comp. with Ps. 78 : 54) being cleansed and made holy.

PROPOSITION 169. *This Theocratic Kingdom embraces the marriage of Christ to the New Jerusalem.*

This is so evident from reasons given in preceding Propositions, such as the *identity* of the new heaven and new earth of Isaiah, Peter and John, the marriage of Christ with the city being announced *just previous* to Millennial age, the incorporation of precisely *the same language and ideas* in describing the New Jerusalem state that is found in Millennial predictions, etc., that we need not repeat the arguments proving the marriage to be Pre-Millennial. Our object under this heading is merely to show *who* the Bride is, and to explain *what* is meant by the marriage relation.

The reader is cautioned that the explanation that we give is not essential to our argument. It is presented merely as a matter of interest to believers, and to induce investigation and consideration. Many Millenarians (Lord, Fausset, etc.) regard the city as figurative or symbolic, or both, as well as Anti-Millenarians, and so far as the Pre-Millennial position of it is concerned, or its connection with the Messiah's Kingdom, it matters little what view is entertained respecting the city. Yet even here it is better to follow the teaching of the Spirit and endeavor, if possible, to ascertain the real meaning. This we endeavor to do, and the reader will find that we are again forced to receive the Primitive Church view on the subject. It is scarcely necessary to repeat that the early Fathers all believed that those who had part in the first resurrection would enjoy the New Jerusalem in Messiah's Kingdom, as e.g. Tertullian has it, "in a city of divine workmanship, viz., Jerusalem brought down from heaven," which he tells us "John saw," etc.

Obs. 1. The Bride is the city New Jerusalem, for *a city is* in prophetical language, (as well as in that of other writers), *personified* by a woman or virgin. Eminent and pious writers entertain different views respecting the city. One party makes it a figurative or symbolical representation of the Church, but still (as Barnes's *Com.*) speak of it as "*a residence,*" "*habitation*" or "*abode,*" which contains "*its inhabitants.*" Another, (as Lord, *Expos. of the Apoc.*) rigidly confines it to a symbolical meaning, indicative of the risen and glorified saints. One view is that (as Dwight, *Theology*) it is a magnificent emblem of the future state—*including residence*—of the redeemed, differing very little from the first one stated. Another is (as *Crit. Eng. N. Test*) that which makes it a figurative representation of this Church, and *also includes* the literal, i.e. a literal city or habitation.[1] One opinion is (as Kurtz, *Sac. His.*) that it denotes a restored *Eden or Paradise,*[2] God again dwelling with man. Another is, that (as Prop. 170, Obs. 2 footnote) it means *the third heaven* or a scene or place *in heaven*, being "eternal in the heavens" (thus ignoring the coming down, etc.) Whitby (*Quest. in Eschat.* by Seiss, p. 47) makes it "the Jewish Church and nation"). One party (as Swedenborgians) make it symbolical of *a renewed state* of the Church as represented, e.g. by themselves, etc. Another (as Fraser, *Key to Proph.*) applies to it the mean-

ing of its adumbrating, "*the national polity of the Jews* during the Millennium." And still another (as early Church, etc.) hold that it represents *a literal city.* Slight modifications (Eichhorn, etc.) of these exist, but do not vary to any extent.[3] Two extremes are noticeable in the interpretation of this New Jerusalem; the Ebionistic, which, if we are to credit some statements (for the matter of Ebionism is involved in obscurity and dispute) applied these predictions too exclusively to *the earthly* Jerusalem, and the Gnostic, which either *spiritualized* it or applied it *to heaven* itself. The truth seems to stand between these two extremes; the heavenly and the earthly being *united* in the earth at the time of restitution. The idea most prevalent is, that the New Jerusalem is *the Church*, and consequently the saints in their associated, aggregate capacity forms the Bride.[4] This conception arises from the fact that the Church is in different places represented under the figure of a woman, the woman in the wilderness and in sackcloth, and as a chaste virgin, presented to Christ. Husbands are exhorted to love their wives as Christ also loves the Church, etc. The Israelites are held forth as "the Fathers to whom God was a husband," and as backsliding children to whom He was "married," and who acted as a treacherous wife. These beautiful and forcible figures (2 Cor. 11 : 2, 3, Eph. 5 : 23, 24; Jer. 3 : 14 and 31 : 32; Hos. 2 : 19, etc.) drawn from the marriage relation—like those of building, planting, etc.—convey the idea *of Christ's love for, union with, and care over* the Church. This has led many—owing to the phraseology used in connection with the city, viz., that of *Bride and Lamb's Wife*—to believe that the Church is here *also* designated the Bride. But this does not necessarily follow; for *just as* the earthly Jerusalem to which God is represented as married is spoken of as distinct and yet including the Jewish nation as her children (owing to her *Theocratic* position,) *so also* the New Jerusalem, while including her children, is spoken of as something with which they are associated, indicating also its distinctiveness. Indeed the Church is (as we shall show hereafter) married, i.e. brought into *intimate and endearing union* with Christ, even in *a higher and nobler sense* than this city, inasmuch as a glorification after the pattern of Christ, and co-heirship with Him in the Rulership, etc., of the Kingdom is *greater and more closely related to Christ* than that of being wedded to the capital city. Let it be also understood, in all our remarks, that while advocating a literal city, we necessarily include, because the city is specially designed for them, the union of the saints with Jesus Christ, and their abiding with the King in this same city. But while the happiness, honor and glory of the Church is *inseparably connected* with the New Jerusalem—while the Church of the first-born is *intimately and permanently united* with the King in the New Jerusalem —*it does not follow* from the figure of marriage used, that the Church is the Bride here intended. Before presenting the reasons why this city is not the Church, but a literal city, *a singular feature* connected with the subject may be noticed. Namely: That whatever opinion may be theoretically applied in the interpretation of the city, the expectations of the Christian heart (abstractly, perhaps, advocating a mere "state" or "condition") favors the opinion of a literal city. For, from the days of the apostles down to the present, believers look forward to the New Jerusalem as "*a place*," "*an abode*," "*habitation*," "*dwelling-place*," "*the bridal city*," "*the royal dowry*," "*the King's Palace*," etc. Even those most inclined to spiritualize it, speak and write of it as of something literal,

as e.g. Prof. Stuart (*Com. Apoc.*, vol. 1. p. 190), "The New Jerusalem comes forth in all the splendor of the upper world, *a dwelling-place fit for the habitation of God and the saints.*" Some of the views mentioned, identifying it with a restored Eden or earth, or symbolizing a place, of course, give it *materiality* in the application. Multitudes, who make it figurative, still admit, that it *also* represents a place of residence, a locality, etc. Writers, who at great length have applied it to the Church, still acknowledge that it is to be regarded as a *habitation* for the saints, *a Paradise* regained, *a glorious city having mansions*, i.e. *places of abode*, for the righteous, and in which Christ shall *personally* dwell. In sermons, prayers, hymns, in our conversation, hopes and longings we generally present this literal aspect, as the one most naturally suggested, and the most consonant with our desires and anticipations. Hence, the advocacy of a literal city is not so far removed from Christian feeling, longing and concurrence, as many suppose.[5]

[1] The *Crit. Eng. Test.*, *loci* mingles the literal and symbolical, saying: "The literal and the figurative may perhaps be mingled in some parts of the description of the New Jerusalem, but the symbolical appears to be the most prevalent." The chief evidence adduced for the latter is derived from "the Bride, the Lamb's wife," which it is supposed could not apply to a material city. This objection will be fully met.

[2] Dr. Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 50), speaking of Paradise, remarks: "The original itself, as the renewed habitation of redeemed man, will hereafter descend to the earth;" and (p. 434) "the heavenly Jerusalem realizes not only the conception involved in the Tabernacle, but fulfils and completes the one set forth in Paradise," etc. Dr. Hamilton (*The Lamp and the Lantern*, p. 55) more explicitly: "While the Apocalyptic curtain slowly rises—while through its fringe of fire the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven, and, gazing on the pearly gates, and peaceful streets, and bowers of sanctity, our planet can scarce believe that she is gazing on herself—that this is old mother earth grown young again—that this vision of holiness and bliss is nothing more than Paradise restored—that 'new' but ancient 'earth' in which dwelleth righteousness."

[3] Some refer it to "the grace of God," or "the existing Church," or "the glorified Church." Waggoner in a lecture stated that a person informed him that he had this city in his heart, upon which he remarked, that he must, indeed, be "large-hearted" to carry within himself such a city with its foundations, walls, gates, and mansions. Thomas (*Eureka*, vol. 3, p. 694), because of the expression, after "the measure of an angel," makes the New Jerusalem in its corporate glorified capacity "an Angel-Man." Those who apply the New Jerusalem to the saints also differ as to the saints indicated, the majority including the saints of all former dispensations, while Brown (evangelist) and others make them to consist only of the saints of the Christian dispensation. We pass by those given by destructive criticism, which makes much of "Oriental imagination," etc., failing to see the exquisite ending of a Divine Plan in its perfection of accomplishment. While some of this class confine themselves merely to an announcement of its being "ideal," the result of a poetic, fervid imagination, some others, in bad taste and worse spirit, proceed to ridicule that which for centuries has supported the hearts of multitudes in trouble, sorrow, bereavement, etc. The influence it has exerted, the esteem in which it is held by multitudes, and even as a literary specimen of an early age, will ever prevent the real student—whatever his opinion—from writing disrespectfully of it.

[4] Bernard (*Prog. of Doc.*, Lec. 8, p. 217) gives a figurative or spiritualistic definition (which, as taught in other Scriptures, we include as one of the features of the restoration) as follows: "The city is a constitution of society complete in its local habitation; the visible collection of buildings being a symbol of the organized life within. It is the most perfect realization and the most convenient representation of society in its maturity, in which the various relations of men so combined as to promote the welfare of the several members and secure the unity of a common life to the whole. 'It is' (as has been said) 'the perfecting of the self provisions of nature and the condition of the highest well-being of man.'" Comp. Lange's *Com.*, Rev., p. 381 and 442, who makes this a "picture of the consummation and fulfilment of the whole Theocracy," etc.

[5] The student will be interested in some references. Thus e.g. Macnight (*Com.*, Heb.

12 : 22) cannot spiritualize the New Jerusalem away, but advocates it as designating locality, or "the place of their (i.e. saints) abode," and as corroborative evidence refers to John 14 : 2 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 13 ; Rev. 21 : 1, adding : "That these accounts of the future felicity of the righteous are not to be interpreted metaphorically, may be gathered from the Gospel doctrine of the resurrection," etc. He approvingly quotes the *Spectator*, vol. 8, No. 580. Even Augustine, with all his spiritualizing, could (*Meditations*, c. 35) make it a real city : "O heavenly Jerusalem ! . . . how happy will my soul perceive itself, when it shall be admitted to see thy glory, thy beauty ; to view the gates, the streets, the stately buildings, the splendor of thy inhabitants, and the triumphant pomp of thy King enthroned in the midst of thee !" (Comp. Baxter's *Saints' Rest*, ch. 15.) Lincoln (*Lects. on Rev.*, vol. 2, p. 202) applies the city to the Church, and then, in the second place, says : "This city is the home of these saints of His. The thought here may appear somewhat complex when it is conjoined with the preceding. Still it is the truth. Even as a human body is the 'house' of a man (Eccl. 12 : 3) and yet is a part of the man himself, so this New Jerusalem is the Church of God, and at the same time is her home," and afterward adds : "This Bride, this city, is the home or house, or 'tabernacle' of God." His reasoning might have force, provided, as in the analogy of the body produced (the spirit or soul dwelling in it), we were told that only the spirits or souls dwelt in the city, whereas we are informed that saints *glorified in person* abide there. Numerous writings evince how exceedingly difficult it is for those who make the city a figure of something else, to rid themselves of its literalness. Thus e.g. Rev. Burdick (*New York Evang.*, Feb. 3d, 1876) says : "This means the whole Church triumphant, put under the symbol of the holy city, New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven. It may also mean more. It may comprehend *the dwelling-places* which God will fit up, as from heaven, for His people to dwell in, 'the house of many mansions,' which shall be upon the new earth." Our religious periodicals have many allusions like the following : Rev. Snowden (*Luth. Obs.*, July 19th, 1878) speaks of the New Jerusalem as presenting "*a material substance*," etc. Ten thousand such illustrations could be given, but the reader can easily verify our position from his own reading.

Obs. 2. The reasons which indicate that the New Jerusalem is *a literal* city are the following. 1. In the usage of the east when a king entered his capitol to rule therefrom, or a prince ascended the throne, it was represented under *the figure of a marriage*, i.e. he was wedded, *intimately and permanently united* to the city, or throne, or people. The use of the figure in the Scriptures shows that we are not to limit it unless specified to the Church. While employed to denote Christ's *union with the Church*, it has been used to mean *other unions*. It designates *the permanent union* of a people *with the land*, as in Isa. 62 where in the Millennial description the land is called "*Beulah*," that is "*married*" (marg. read.), and it is said : "*thy land shall be married, for as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee*," etc. Then the figure rises still higher, including *God's marriage* (i.e. dwelling again with man on the earth) *with the land*, for it is added : "*as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee.*" The *earthly Jerusalem* is personified as a woman, and God, when dwelling there by a visible representation, is declared *to be married* to her, i.e. *to the city itself*. But just as soon as the city was filled with wickedness, she is represented as *an adulterous* woman, and God withdraws from her. In Ezek. 16, is such a description of marriage, which, in view of the alleged birth, parentage, etc., *can only* be applied directly to the city, which becomes by virtue of this relationship the representative of the nation (see Prop. 118 on Barren Woman). Then again, God is spoken of *as married to the nation*, because abiding with them, as Ruler in a special manner. Now, considering that (Prop. 170) Jesus has gone before to prepare a place for us to be incorporated into the Father's house, that this place or inheritance is "ready to be revealed in the last time" (so context demands, including saints) ; that when the last

time does come it is represented as descending from God out of heaven upon the new earth, that the figure of marriage is applied to a literal city (as the old Jerusalem), there is no impropriety but rather *eminent fitness that the union of the King of kings with His metropolitan city should be designated under the same figure, implying the most intimate and permanent relationship.* Thus the figure of marriage, which to many is the main objection to the idea of a literal city, serves rather to indicate it. 2. For, the figure itself is explained in the description of the city in so significant a manner, and in such complete contrast to the use made of it formerly in reference to the earthly Jerusalem, that it cannot possibly be applied to any other but a literal city. It is expressly declared that "*the throne of God and the Lamb,*" is in this city. This affirms its *Theocratic* position, as *the capitol* of the Kingdom. Covenant and promise, as we have seen, make David's Throne the Throne of God, for God adopts and incorporates it into *His Theocratic arrangement,* and promises that David's seed who is to occupy it forever, etc., is to be His Son, to whom He is the Father. The Throne of David then is the Throne of God and that of the Lamb, and this Throne is to be set up in this very city, the New Jerusalem. (The union of the heavenly and that of the earthly, thus making one city, will be noticed below—*the locality* where David's throne was in existence is implied.) Hence, at this period and the identification of the earthly Jerusalem with this descended city, "*at that time they shall call Jerusalem the Throne of the Lord, and all nations shall be gathered into it, to the Name of the Lord to Jerusalem,*" etc. Thus we have *the metropolitan* character, *the royal precedency* of the city designated. The *only throne* that covenant and prophecy recognize in its Theocratic ordering (for the Divine Sovereignty is something separate and distinct, and even sets up this Throne, Props. 79, 84), *is the Davidic* and, in the very nature of the case, if restored as predicted and sworn to by God, it necessarily embraces, in view of its relationship to the elect Jewish nation and through them to the Gentiles—the notion of *a material* city which contains it. Now the setting up of this Throne in it, *is the act of marriage;* it is that which makes *the union.* For, just as God was *formerly married* to the earthly Jerusalem *when His Theocratic Throne* was there, so, carrying out the same beautiful prophetical figure, He is *again married,* when the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven upon the earth, *by the very act of erecting His Theocratic Throne* there and ever abiding in it in His glorified humanity, as David's Son, "The Christ."[1] 3. The dwelling-place of God, the place where He tabernacled among men always, in former days (as in the tabernacle and temple) assumed *a material* form adapting it not only to the actual requirements of humanity, but looking forward to the period when *a glorified humanity, united to the divine,* in its accessibility, etc., should again dwell with man. Now *materiality in the Theocratic sense and relationship* is always associated with the dwelling of God with the Jewish nation; they are not and cannot be separated without violence. The place was *a specific one* to which the nation could come to worship and honor the Mighty Ruler. Now when the prophet announces (Rev. 21 : 2) the coming down of "*the holy city New Jerusalem,*" a great voice is heard saying: "*Behold the tabernacle of God is with men and He will dwell with them,*" etc.—thus designating the city itself as *the tabernacle or special place* where God shall manifest Himself. That *dwelling-place* which was once a tent, then a temple, now is exhibited as *a city,* but still designated

"*the tabernacle of God*," as if purposely to associate with it the idea of *locality—of a place* to which the nations can go to honor and worship the King. In view of God and David's Son being united as the One Theocratic Ruler; in view of the body of Saints being associated as joint Rulers; in view of the extent, majesty, and glory of the Kingdom inaugurated; and in view of the restoration of forfeited blessings and the grand Redemptive process going on, a tent, and a temple, and even earthly surroundings as were attached to the Davidic Throne, *must give place to a city*, which includes in it the glory of the tent, and of the temple, and of Paradise, and of the heavenly world. 4. In the portraiture of the city, the saints or inhabitants of it and the righteous are represented as *separate and distinct* from it, as in Rev. 21 : 24, 25, 26, 27 and Rev. 22 : 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 19. That is, they are permitted *to enter and enjoy*, or *to witness and participate* in its splendor and glory; so that the city, which *one of the brethren* (Rev. 22 : 9) shows is portrayed as *a place* into which, and to which the righteous come, and *not* as the saints themselves. This distinction the apostle Paul closely makes in Heb. 12 : 22, 23 *between* "*the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem*" and "the general assembly and Church of the first-born," as admitted by numerous commentators (as Barnes, Bloomfield, Stuart, etc.)[2] thus according with the discrimination made by the prophets (as e.g. Isa. 65 : 17, 18 in which God promises, "to create *Jerusalem* a rejoicing and *her people* a joy"). The same *contrast* is presented by Paul in Gal. 4, where he speaks of the earthly Jerusalem and then of her inhabitants, and of those related to her as her children, and preserves the same distinction in speaking of the heavenly Jerusalem and her children. 5. The declaration (Rev. 21 : 22) that the city had no temple (such as the earthly Jerusalem) excepting that constituted by "*the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb*" (with which the temple formed by the saints is associated because of their co-heirship with Jesus Christ), can only be predicated of *a material city*. While indicative of the visibility of the Mighty King, the whole city being become "a holy of holies," the language expressive of seeing no one building separated specially as a temple has only force when applied to *a literal* city. 6. The distinction *between* the saints and the city, also implying the literalness of the latter, is evidenced by a large class of passages which speak of the ancient saints "*looking for a city*," of all believers "*seeking a continuing city*," and of God "*having prepared for them a city*," etc. We have only to open the commentaries of our opponents, and there we find numerous interpretations which declare that this "*city*," held in reserve for these saints and believers, and which God prepares, is a place, an actual, real abiding dwelling-place, etc., for them. Hence, taking their own comments concerning "the city" in other places of the Scriptures, we certainly are justified in applying them to the city *when* it is revealed from heaven. If a locality, etc., in the third heaven, the descent from thence, surely does *not change* its nature; while its coming down confirms the relationship that the saints sustain to it in the renewed earth, etc. 7. This again corresponds with another class of passages which describe Jerusalem as putting on her beautiful garments, binding the saints or righteous upon her, as a bride putteth on her ornaments, arraying herself in the righteousness and glory of the saints, making herself a *glorious city* by reason of the number, holiness and happiness of her citizens, etc. Now, while some of these prophetic announcements refer more particularly to that earthly portion of

Jerusalem which will be rebuilt, yet it includes that portion (the new) which will be added to or joined with it. The descriptions are *too lofty and grand,* the phraseology and ideas are so *similar* to that employed in the delineation of the New Jerusalem, that they cannot be separated ; *both* are embraced by the prophets. If the student will e.g. compare Isa. 54 : 11, 12 and Isa. 60 : 14–20 with the description of the city by John, he can see how the Spirit recognizes *the descending city,* which John long after more minutely describes, as forming *a magnificent portion of the great metropolis* of the Messiah. 8. But that the saints are not denoted, and that the reference is to a material city, is found in the fact that the saints are represented (Rev. 19 : 9) when the marriage (i.e. this setting up of the Theocratic Throne) takes place as *guests, the called or invited,* who enjoy the marriage supper, the feast that the prophets describe. They cannot be, in this case, the Guests and the Bride *at the same time ;* and, as we have shown in several places, the Spirit is careful, even in the employment of figures, not to introduce a violation of propriety. Hence, in reference to this wedding—this particular union *also* represented by the marriage relation—believers are the invited guests, the called, who are virgins waiting for the Bridegroom and Bride, and who have on the wedding garment not as the Bride but *as guests* who now participate in and enjoy the unbounded blessings resulting from this splendidly restored *Theocratic enthronement in a city* prepared for the King. The appropriateness and exquisite delicacy of calling the result of this union "a feast of fat things," "a marriage supper," etc., fully appears when we come to understand what is meant by the Bridegroom, the Bride, the Marriage, and the Guests. Need we wonder at the exalted language held by prophets, when attempting to describe either of them separately or all of them conjoined. The grandeur, unspeakably great—the blessings, beyond imagination—the glory, exceeding the conceptions of man, spring from the pre-determined, continuously held, and finally triumphant manifested Theocratic plan.[3] 9. Allow this Theocratic ordering, accept of the Covenanted Throne and Kingdom as specifically given to David's Son, and reason itself dictates, in view of the glorification, greatness, and majesty of this King, that in His enthronement here, *a city commensurate with the august Personage* should be provided. Instead of the splendor of the city reflecting doubt upon its materiality, it is just such a city *as is worthy* of the now exalted, stately Son of David. It is *the most reasonable thing* to expect, that the dwelling-place of the King of kings, where His own glory and that of the Redeemed is to be displayed in a striking manner to the eyes and hearts of the nations, should be *exceedingly* beautiful, rich and abounding in that which man regards precious. It is reasonable to suppose that a King *with such power and wisdom* will highly adorn the place of His throne, or, as the prophet says : "*beautify the place of His Sanctuary, and make the place of His feet glorious.*" The pearly gates, the golden streets, the foundations of costly stones, etc., which stagger the faith of some, are only what the immediate material surroundings of such a Monarch, uniting God and Man in an earthly rule, should possess *as proportionate to His dignity and station.* Therefore, the babes and the wise in Christ not only exhibit their faith in the city, but likewise in the ability of God to create, and in its suitableness for the intended purpose, when they hope to enter such pearly gates, walk such golden streets, etc. The partial particularizing, and the "like unto," are of such a nature that *the reality may greatly*

exceed even the description. At least, Jesus will give us *His idea* of what a city ought to be when destined to be *the metropolitan city* of the renewed earth. The city which God would not allow man to build (Gen. 11) to make unto Himself a name (significant of unity and exaltation over the earth) instead of seeking to praise and exalt God, He now, *when the proper time has arrived*, establishes upon earth, *the centre* of knowledge, power, honor, and riches, and *the expression* of existing unity and exaltation—the city above all cities, "*the perfection of beauty*" and "*the joy of the whole earth*," literally and truly "*The city of the Great King.*"[4]

[1] Here (comp. Prop. 118) we obtain a clew to the reason why this Jerusalem is called "New." It is not merely "New" in contrast with the "Old" (also restored and renewed), but "New" because this city is newly and specially made for the Theocratic relationship to be manifested; it is the King's city in which He is enthroned, and, therefore, expressly prepared for Him. The "Old" is honored and blessed, but "the New," containing royalty and its accompaniments, is correspondingly exalted.

[2] It is certainly remarkable that so many of our opponents totally forget, in their comments on the New Jerusalem of Heb. 12 : 22, all their objections to a literal city as against us in interpreting Rev., chs. 21 and 22. Thus to illustrate : Barnes (*Com. loci*) speaks of it as "*the city* where the living God dwells—the heavenly Jerusalem"—the place of "abode," e.g. "in a more *literal* and glorious sense His *abode* in heaven," "*a magnificent city* where God and angels dwell," which is to be "*the final home*" of Christians, "*the eternal home*," "dwellers in that *city*." So Barnes on Heb. 11 : 10, referring it to heaven, speaks of the city as "a place," "a fixed habitation and a permanent inheritance," "the permanent abode of the righteous," "fixed residence of the just in heaven," "a permanent home in a future world." He even forgets the symbolic cast given in his *Exp. of Revelation*, and refers to the New Jerusalem of St. John as denoting the same. But in such a reference he and all other similar commentators involve themselves in *the most palpable contradictions*. Thus e.g. while opposing the Millenarian view, while making the New Jerusalem of John as much as possible symbolical of the saints in order to meet the force of the descending from heaven, he totally overlooks the antagonism that he erects by making the New Jerusalem the exact equivalent of the third heaven as a fixed and permanent abode, etc. For, taking his interpretation in Hebrews for granted, then it follows that *the third heaven itself*—the advocated *fixed and eternal dwelling place* of the righteous—according to John, *comes down to earth*. Such is the absurdity involved, while the language of John, "out of heaven," etc., indicates something separate and distinct from heaven itself. The student will, therefore, notice that any interpretation which does not discriminate between the city itself and the third heaven, is certainly defective and unscriptural. The Spirit justly indicates a material difference, and we must observe the same. Hence, we must reject as utterly untenable any theory that seeks to destroy the force of this city "coming down from God, out of heaven." The plea sometimes offered that the New Jerusalem is too glorious for earth, and must remain inseparably with the third heaven, is directly antagonistic to God's promise, and His glory as predicted. Such works as *Heaven our Home* (ch. 4), which make the city a type of the third heaven, and then, in the same breath, speak of it as a locality, "a habitation" expressive of reality, and then, to fill out its portraiture, mix up the present and the future, utterly ignoring—because hostile to its view—the promise of its descending, are only misleading. In the same category is Edwards's *His. of Redemp.* (p. 424), Waldegrave's *New Test. Mill.* (Lect. 6), and many others. The variety—all in the same line—is great. Smith (*Key to Rev.*, p. 386) makes the New Jerusalem "a type of the Church and of heaven," and "the tabernacle of God is with man; not that heaven has come down to earth, as some imagine, but that the saints are raised to God in heaven." Language just the reverse of that given by the Spirit.

[3] See Bonar's *Eternal Day*, Cumming's *Lec. on Apoc.*, first and second series, Seiss's *Last Times*, Noel's *Prospects of the Church*, etc., for more extended descriptions of the city, inculcating the idea expressed. The reader will find some fine passages in Bickersteth's *Yesterday, To-day, and Forever*. In a note (p. 437) to line 128, B. 12, Bickersteth takes the position that the New Jerusalem is *both* real and typical, just as Babylon while typifying a power also included a literal city, etc. He, therefore, with the typical, speaks of "an actual fabric, composed of heavenly material, which shall never be destroyed," of a "home, a glorious reality, an abiding city yet to come," and adds : "For as the glorified body will be the worthy habitation of the perfectly regenerate spirit—a building of God,

an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens—so the celestial city will be the meet dwelling-place of the saints forever, and their spiritual characteristics will each and all find a counterpart in that marvellous structure prepared for them by their God.''

[4] Other considerations favorable to our view might be pressed, as (1) the leaves of the tree of life (con. with the city) designed for the healing of the nations, something separate and distinct from the glorified Church ; (2) the Bride being omitted in the Parable of the Ten Virgins and of the marriage feast, and believers and the faithful being invited ; (3) the mention of '' The Beloved City,'' Rev. 20 : 9, without figure in an evident historical statement ; (4) the faith of Abraham, etc., who '' looked for a city,'' evidently, as a comparison shows, not supported by the conception that mysticism or symbolism suggests ; (5) simple unity requires a literal city, for God promises '' a city ;'' Jesus goes to prepare a place—the city and place are one—this city or place an inheritance reserved for us—the same shall be revealed from heaven at the last time—this revelation takes place when Jesus comes—this city thus revealed and inherited must be the promised, prepared, reserved, and finally revealed city ; (6) the reference to the natural sources of light, the sun and moon, as not needed (owing to the effulgence or brightness of the Divine glory), is such as the idea of a material city suggests.

Obs. 3. The immense size of the city forms in the minds of many *the most formidable objection* to the reception of the description as representative of a real, literal city. This is increased by many commentators making the extent of the walls three hundred and seventy-five miles, and then, as our version, '' the length and the breadth and the height of it are equal,'' some make a height of nearly ninety-five miles and others of three hundred and seventy-five. The latter consideration causes Barnes (*Com. loci*) to pronounce it '' absurd'' to entertain '' the idea of a city literally descending from heaven and being set upon the earth with such proportions—three hundred and seventy-five miles high, made of gold.''[1] It is exceedingly doubtful whether such a criticism is just to the meaning of the description, for even persons who make the city a symbolical representation (and hence have no reason for introducing such a definition) make the same to denote simply *uniformity*. Thus e.g. Lord (*Expos. Apoc.*) says : '' that the length of the city is equal, and its breadth and its height denotes not that its length, breadth, and height *are the same*, but simply that its length is the same at all points, its breadth the same at all points, and *its height at all points the same.*'' (This then implies that this city has not a number of streets, or a portion of the place, grandly built, and the rest, like our cities, of an inferior quality, but that *all* the mansions, from centre to circumference, are *all* magnificent and glorious.) While *the precise measurement* of the city according to an announced standard is also in favor of a literal city, we are not specially concerned in advocating either of the views here expressed—although the latter appears to be the meaning of the angel.[2] For we anticipate remarkable things, quite beyond the course of nature, to take place at the Second Advent. This city is not more incredible than that a virgin should bring forth a Son, that angels can fly as quickly through great distances as Daniel makes them, and a number of other things recorded requiring for their fulfilment the intervention and support of the supernatural. Therefore, while the objection has a certain propriety coming from the unbeliever in the Supernatural, it certainly is illogical and unscriptural coming from a believer in the Word, and in the attributes of the Mighty God presented by the Word—seeing that it virtually limits the power, wisdom, and skill of the Divine Architect.[3] Behold the Builder of this city place this ponderous earth in its orbit, suspended on nothing, swiftly passing along its allotted course ; then see Him place a massive body

in its orbit around the earth, and other earths or worlds each in their orbits around the vast planted sun and thus on and on in the immensity of space exhibiting illimitable power, etc.—and then doubt if you can, *the ability* of the Almighty to produce a city *so vast* in extent, *so grand* in its proportions. The question, in this case, is not whether we can comprehend *how* such a city can be erected, etc. (for *like Abraham* we are to receive the promise if we cannot tell how God will accomplish it,) but whether *it is really promised.* If it can be shown that such a literal city is not required by the Theocratic ordering, or that its production would conflict with the moral attributes of God, or that it is opposed by previously given Revelation—in brief, by an appeal to reason proving it to be unreasonable outside of an appeal to our limited comprehension and a lessening of the Divine power (which is itself unreasonable), then indeed an argument would be formed worthy of serious consideration. We may well leave the height, which is a matter of controversy, *with the Builder,* who will give it that proportion and that extent best adapted to contain the mansions of the saints, and to manifest His own glory. It manifests "the Glory of God," verifying Jno. 17 : 22, etc.

[1] This is almost equivalent to what a writer (*Westm. Review,* Oct., 1861, Art. 5) sarcastically observes : "The architecture of the Theocratic metropolis is purely ideal. Like the impossible Parthian army of a previous passage, which amounted to a fifth or perhaps only a sixth part of the present entire population of the world, we have a city whose length, breadth and height are equal (about fifteen hundred miles), suggesting the notion of rather an awkward ultra-equatorial protuberance, which seems to trouble even the ruridecanal intellect, so that the secular mind may safely confess to some irreligious misgivings."

[2] Other views are given, as that the measurement includes the entire circumference ; that the height is that of the city above the earth, etc. There is a statement made by Mr. Begg, quoted by Brooks, *Elem. of Proph. Interp.*, that is worthy of notice : "John, in his measurements, does not specify its length or breadth, but having mentioned that it is square, he gives the measurement accordingly : 'And the city lieth four square and the length is as large as the breadth. And he (the angel) measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height are equal.' It was not the length or breadth or height which the angel measured. These, indeed, he declares equal, but the twelve thousand furlongs, instead of being the dimensions of each or any of its sides, as is commonly supposed, are the measurement of the city 'four square.' We consider this, therefore, as neither the length nor the breadth, but as the measurement of the *area* of the city," etc. He thus makes the sides nearly ten miles, etc., using the Jewish furlong of Maimonides. So also a friend of mine, Rev. Rowe, makes the same measurement. The critical student will observe that our position must be the correct one, for otherwise the all-intelligent Spirit would introduce an outrageous disproportion between the walls of the city and the city itself ; with our view the walls are *proportionate* to the extent. Vitringa and others favor the area theory.

[3] Hence we dislike to see believers (as e.g. Wilson in *Proph. Times,* New Ser., March, 1876, p. 96) in advocacy of the symbolic nature of the city, ground the same upon such reasoning : "As a literal city, it must be regarded as *grotesque and improbable ;* for what could be *more so* than that a city of its materials and dimensions should be built in the aerial heaven, and descend upon the earth." If it is symbolic, this must be proven from other considerations than those of improbability or impossibility (as seen e.g. in the interpretation of the incarnation, etc.), seeing that God "*is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think,*" etc. Wilson in *Proph. Times* for April, 1876, p. 116, etc., makes the New Jerusalem the symbol of the saints associated with Christ in a new polity, and refers to Rev. 3 : 12 (which distinguishes between the saints and the city in the name of the latter) ; Heb. 12 : 22 (which also distinguishes between the two), and Gal. 4 : 26), which by the very contrast to the one literal Jerusalem, the earthly, indicates that the other, the New, is not symbolic). The New Jerusalem is, indeed, connected with "a new polity," and saints identified with the city are "a divinely chosen hierarchy of kings and priests," but this does not constitute them the same. The origin of the city as purely and exclusively heavenly (like glorified body), and its coming down

out of heaven from God, alone distinguishes it from the saints, who, under divine power from above, are made such by probation, trial, etc., here on the earth. Wilson, in the same article, finds, however, so much that is favorable to a material city in the prophets that he forcibly advocates the same as the residence, metropolis, of Christ and the saints. He thus virtually, while making the New Jerusalem a mere polity, gives us the city that we advocate "enlarged and adorned," and brings the saints into an intimate and abiding union (figuratively represented by Oriental nations by "marriage") with the same.

Obs. 4. The restoration of the Davidic throne and the occupation of it by David's Son, necessarily includes the fact, so plainly predicted by the prophets, that when the Messiah comes to reign, He will set up His throne *at the same place* formerly occupied by David's throne. This throne was not "*in the third heaven*" and not "*in the air above the earth*," but was located *on the earth, in Palestine, at Jerusalem.* Any theory that locates that throne away from the locality it once possessed, *is certainly defective*, being contrary to the predictions and the desire expressed by the Theocratic King Ps. 132 : 13, 14. The covenant made with David, if faithfully carried out as sworn to, requires His immortal Son to reign gloriously *in the same place* formerly occupied by David Himself. Therefore to make the New Jerusalem to be heaven itself, as some do ; or a place forever in the third heaven, as others do ; or that it will not come down (as declared), but that a communication, typified by Jacob's ladder, will alone exist between the New and the Old, as others hold ; or that there is no Jerusalem, a city, which comes down, as still others maintain[1]—is *utterly irreconcilable* with the entire tenor and spirit *of both covenant and prophecy* which insists upon a literal, personal manifestation of Jesus Christ, the Messiah, *upon the throne of David, in David's city and in the midst of the restored Jewish nation.* The Theocratic relationship is not fully restored *without this feature*, and the inheritance of David's Son is not possessed unless Zion's hill *is again occupied by Him.* Indeed we cannot help being surprised at the eminently consistent and scriptural statements on this point contained in the Confession of Faith presented to Charles II. A.D. 1660 (Crosby's *Hist. of the Baptists*, Appendix) signed by John Bunyan and forty others ; in which after declaring that Christ will come and "take to Himself His Kingdom, and will, according to the Scriptures, *reign on the throne of His Father David, on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, forever,*" the following occurs : "We believe that the New Jerusalem that shall come down from God out of heaven, when the tabernacle of God shall be with them, and He will dwell among them, will be *the metropolitan city* of this Kingdom, and will be *the glorious place of residence* of both Christ and His saints forever, and will be *so situated as that the Kingly palace will be on Mount Zion, the holy hill of David, where His throne was.*" Now, while it is extremely difficult, owing to our having no detailed explanation but only general statements respecting its location, to explain all the particulars concerning it, yet the Scriptures give us hints which serve to confirm the interpretation that the New Jerusalem will embrace *in its area the locality* of Mount Zion.[2] While discarding the explanations given by some (Begg and others) derived from Ezekiel's description (for the reasons assigned under Prop. 172, making that arrangement conditional on the repentance of the people) yet those very explanations are valuable, because they fully evince that God allies the enthronement of the Prince, David's Son, in *this same locality*—that Mount Zion, David's hill, and the restored throne of

David are *not to be separated.* Let the reader carefully consider that in the description of the rebuilding and adornment of the earthly portion of ancient Jerusalem such rebuilding is only directly affirmed and described to extend from a certain part of the city northward, westward and eastward, and for a particular reason *southward* is omitted. Thus Zech. 14 : 10 (comp. Jer. 31 : 38–40) which has so greatly preplexed commentators specifies an enlargement of the old Jerusalem northward, extending to Geba and Rimmon (south from them to Jerusalem), and then in the rebuilding appears only to include a portion of the city, leaving out the city of David proper, for a straight line running across from the point of the city mentioned to where the king's wine-presses are usually located, would *leave out* David's part of the city. Whatever may be thought of such an interpretation of the passage ; whether admissible or not, it is certain that Zechariah by the Spirit includes *the conjunction* of the New Jerusalem with the rebuilt Old in "*the waters that go out of Jerusalem,*' as compared with Rev. 22 : 1, 2. At least it is entirely consistent with the spirit of prophetical delineation to make the New Jerusalem planted with its north side *within* the bounds of the old Jerusalem, taking in David's city, and then extending southward, etc., embracing a portion of the desert. The prominence that is given to Mount Zion above the rest of the city, the descriptions of it so characteristic of the New Jerusalem, the making of Judah's territory especially holy, the inheriting (Zech. 2 : 12, etc.) of the Messiah of His portion in the land, the changes that are attributed to the rejoicing desert, the constituting Jerusalem "the throne of the Lord," the astonishing transformations that are to be witnessed, the linking it with the new heaven and earth, the inexpressible glory attributed to the restored Davidic throne, etc.—these things considered *connectedly*, relating to the same period of restitution and enthronement, leave a strong and irresistible impression that the Old and New Jerusalem are *permanently united ;* the one part specially designed for the King and the saints into which the kings of the earth, the representatives of the nations, enter, and the other part intended for the restored Jewish nation, as a kind of suburb or extension of the city embracing some of its subjects constantly living in the light and beholding the glory of the former. To this there may be an allusion in Ps. 122 : 3, "*Jerusalem is built as a city that is compact together*" which is rendered by others (as e.g. *Crit. Eng. Test.*, by Blackley & Hawes, p. 872) "*Jerusalem that is built as a city that is coupled or joined together to itself.*" Instead of making the Old rebuilt the New (as even e.g. Eusebius in flattery to Constantine and his mother, Helena), or constituting two Jerusalems in that age (as many do) the prophets, whom we endeavor to imitate, speak of them *as one*, sometimes describing one portion and then again the other, because of *the immediate close conjunction* existing between them, for the New is added as an addition, most glorious and suitable for such a David's Son, to the Old, thus making it (Isa. 62 : 3, Hebrew) "*a diadem of a Kingdom.*" [1]

[1] Waggoner (*Ref. of Age to Come*, p. 63) says : "I. M. Stephenson quoted Dr. Thomas to show that there is not any New Jerusalem really in heaven, but that 'Jerusalem which is above' is above only in the sense of being exalted, which denotes the position she will occupy in the Age to Come ;" and he justly adds : "But if the word 'above' signifies her honor and glory, and not her location, then her 'coming down,' Rev. 21 : 2, must denote her abasement and deprivation ot that glory. This criticism of Dr. Thomas is not correct." Graff, Greybeard's *Lay Sermons*, No. 35, correctly makes the New Jerusalem "the official residence" of the saints, and in "visible association with the earth," but he

has it suspended in the air, and remarks: "That 'glory,' like a star—an added satellite to the planet on which we live—will appear immediately over Jerusalem in Judea, and its light will dim the glory of the sun." This picture, however pretty, is not according to scriptural analogy. Rev. J. Denham Smith, who approvingly quotes Bellett (*Chr. Herald*, June 5th, 1879), carefully locates the city in the air and not on the earth, in order to avoid the charge of carnality and a lowering of saints. Such sensitiveness, where God's Theocratic ordering and the covenanted inheritance of David's Son is in question, is misplaced. Baxter (*Chr. Herald*, March 27th, 1879) insists upon placing it in "the air," and urges two reasons: (1) Its size making it incongruous "to be poised upon a globe only five times (24,000 miles) greater in circumference." This is answered in the text. (2) It "is nowhere stated to come on the earth." To this we reply: It is undoubtedly implied in Rev. 21, coming down from God, out of heaven, into this renewed earth, and its identification with the earth itself is positive from *the exact location* of the place of inheritance and of David's throne (*not in the air!*), and by the manner in which the prophets (e.g. Isa., chs. 45 and 60) describe it as pertaining actually to the earth, and *easy of access* to the nations who visit it, etc. (Comp. Prop. 168, On Place of Manifested Royalty.)

[2] The critical student will observe a feature that strongly confirms our position over against the spiritualizing system. If the spiritualizing application to the Church were correct, then the predictions ought to relate more to Mt. Moriah, where the temple was and God's worship was specially conducted; but instead of this, the decided and constant preference is given to Mt. Zion, where David's throne was located. Why such a preference? Our entire line of argument shows why it is thus presented, viz., the Theocratic ordering which had its real centre associated with Mt. Zion. This in itself shows that when Zion is restored, the Theocracy under the Messiah is also established. Hence, in view of the inseparable conjunction of Zion and the New Jerusalem, we have the Spirit in prophecy using the one or the other to express the Theocratic ordering still future. This at once indicates, as our argument shows, that, as to locality, the New Jerusalem is connected with Mt. Zion in Palestine, and that it is not, as e.g. Baxter (*Coming Wars*), suspended in the sky, from which the Lord Jesus and the saints descend every day for governmental purposes, and retire to at night (and at the end of one thousand years these visits to the earth are discontinued). This is simply to overlook the locality, etc., of the covenanted restored Davidic throne, which the Messiah occupies, the nature and perpetuity of the Kingdom. In the inheritance of the saints we must not overlook that this includes the inheritance of God Himself, as the portion of "the royal priesthood" (comp. e.g. Numb. 18 : 20; Deut. 10 : 9 and 18 : 1, 2; Josh. 13 : 33; Ps. 16 : 5, etc., in their relationship to the people gathered out). This forms the climax of the saints' glory; the unchangeable foundation of eternal bliss; the exaltation and divinity of the Theocratic King; the splendor and majesty of the Kingdom.

[3] This future New Jerusalem, dependent upon a personal Sec. Advent and associated with the covenanted Theocratic Kingdom, enables us to set aside the vagaries of the past and present, which misapply the promises pertaining to the same, as e.g. the appropriation of New Jerusalem by the Swedenborgians (*Works*), the Zion by the early Anabaptists (Mosheim, etc.), the New Zion by the Zionites (Rousdorf, Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 273), the Zion by the Mormons (*Works*), Morin's effort to found the New Jerusalem ("Bastile," *Eclec. Mag.*, Ap., 1876), the New Jerusalem of Eva Von Buttlar (Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 273), and of the prophet Proli (Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2. p. 40), etc., including the Protestant misapplications to their respective churches, or to the Church as a whole.

This subject in connection with the Prop. on the place of manifested royalty, etc., evidently, by implication, teaches us where Eden or Paradise was originally located. If we take the articles in Relig. Encyclops. on Eden or Paradise, we find various conjectures (taken e.g. from the present formation of the earth, without considering the vast changes that were since introduced) as to locality, such as Armenia, India, "the highest place of the earth," Palestine, China, Ceylon, Syria, Persia, Babylonia, Arabia, Ethiopia, etc. It is the most reasonable to suppose Palestine (of which the promise is that it shall be like the garden of Eden) was thus originally favored, because it will be *the place* where the Second Adam is manifested in His glory, it being His chosen place, and where His saints exhibit their redemption. The place forfeited by sin will be restored in greater grandeur, and in it we find "the tree of life" again made accessible to man. We only add, as suggestive, that by the direct supernatural intervention great and astounding changes will be made in levelling the land, etc., making it suitable for the reception of the city. In addition, many writers of prophecy believe, as the Dead Sea is about 1300 feet lower than the Mediterranean Sea (so e.g. Warner, *In the Levant*, p. 107), a channel

CALVARY BAPTIST SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY
LANSDALE, PENNSYLVANIA

of communication will be cut from the latter to the former, and from thence to the Red Sea.

Dr. Craven in Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 390, etc., gives the idea that the New Jerusalem "will exist: 1. As *a real city*—the glorious home and capital of a glorified community. 2. As a *material symbol* of that community, its order and glory." The reason why he has the second notion attached, arises from the city being called "the Bride," which he is forced to apply to the Church. Our explanation conclusively shows that this does not logically follow, because the marriage relation is scripturally used to denote the intimate and enduring relationship existing between the King and His capital where He is enthroned. Craven insists upon the materiality of a great city as the most natural conclusion, as being necessary, as fitting for the glorified, as properly related to the restitution, etc. He also correctly distinguishes "between the material city and the new earth," "the citizens of the city and the nations," etc. The order of time when revealed, etc., is carefully noticed under Prop 151, compared with Props. 148, 149, and 150. We must object to Craven's locating the New Jerusalem *after* the Mill. age for the reasons there assigned. When the Davidic throne is restored and the Theocratic ordering once inaugurated at Mt. Zion, it will—as the prophets agree—be perpetual. The saints occupy this city, *not* a thousand years *after* the Kingdom is established, but at the beginning of the Mill. era; and being here *on the earth* at the close of the Mill., they do not descend from the third heaven after the Mill. age. The time of marriage, the unity of prediction, the relation of the city to the Theocracy, etc., demand its Pre-Mill. arrival. We thus agree with Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, Elliott, and many others in making the New Jerusalem also Millennial.

PROPOSITION 170. *This doctrine of the Kingdom fully sustained by the "Father's House" of John* 14 : 2.

It is important to consider this Scripture referred to, since it is supposed by many to form an objection to our doctrine of the Kingdom ; whereas correctly apprehended according to the analogy of Holy Writ, it forms an additional proof in behalf of our position.

Obs. 1. Probably no passage of Revelation has received in modern times *such extravagant* interpretation as John 14 : 1–3. The early Church well posted in the meaning of the "Father's house," and assigning to it only its scriptural definition, had no difficulty with it (seeing that none is intimated). It was described to them by covenant and prophecy ; it was handed to them by inspired teachers ; it was so universally comprehended by them, as a result of the general instruction and belief in the Theocratic Kingdom, that it required centuries before the theories, now so prevalent, found an entrance into the Church. Those early believers more logically consistent than many eminent moderns, rested satisfied with the description of the house as given in the Old Test., and hence were protected against those interpretations afterward fastened upon the passage. They instead of *isolating* these verses and explaining them *independently* of all others, interpreted them in the light of previously given Revelation. We are mainly indebted again to Origen for a departure from the primitive faith. He (in *De Princip.*, B. 2, ch. 11) makes out the Father's house to mean "*spheres*, i.e., globes" or "*heavens*," and (in B. 11, S. 6) he speaks of it as follows : "I think, therefore, that all the saints who depart this life will remain in some place situated on the earth which Holy Scripture calls Paradise" (comp. with Justin) "as in some place of instruction ;" then, after certain progress, these saints ascend to "*spheres*" or heavens, reaching the Kingdom of heaven ; and in proof of their passing through various places, he directly quotes : "*In my Father's house are many mansions*," etc. Origen's progeny has been prolific.[1] This notion of his entirely adopted by some and extended into imaginary details, finds its indorsement in popular commentaries, as e.g. Barnes (*Com.* Jno. 14 : 1) who says this "*house*" "*may include the Universe*," and speaks of "*removing from one apartment of God's universal dwelling-place to another.*" Imagination has painted this "house" in as many varied forms and hues as either fancy, or the astronomical knowledge of the parties could suggest, as e.g. that it was the universe, the mansions being the planets or worlds ; or, that it was the central part of the universe around which all planets and systems revolve, etc. Others, more soberly, define it to be "the third heaven" without indicating its position. Numerous works, such as *Our Eternal Home, Our Heavenly Home, Heaven, Meet for Heaven, Gates Ajar,* etc., etc., while containing

much that is interesting and valuable, embrace this change of interpretation suggested by Origen, adopted by the faithful forerunners of the Papacy, incorporated by the Popish doctors viz. that this "house" is either "the third heaven" or some place "above or beyond the stars," which is "the special dwelling-place of the Father" or "the Palace of God." Eloquence, poetry, hymnology, theology, etc.[2] endeavor—without *the least proof* and resting solely on *mere assumption*—to elevate this into the truth of God. Men of eminence and ability, of earnest and devoted piety, resting in the misconceived notion of the covenanted Kingdom and inheritance, accept of these changes as in accord with their conceptions of the Kingdom and inheritance, and hence do not stop to examine the passage as it stands *related to both covenant and prophecy*. Some, unnecessarily perplexed by the numerous suppositions unauthorized by the Word, have fallen into another and equally untenable position, viz. "that where the place (i.e. Father's house) is, cannot be determined," and that "it becomes us to be silent when Divine revelation is so"—thus taking it for granted that the Bible *is silent* on the subject because they fail to compare Scripture with Scripture, and to regard the phraseology of Christ in its Jewish or rather Prophetical aspect. As intimated, the cause of all such departures lies in *the misconception of the Kingdom that is covenanted to Jesus Christ*, and in which the saints are to have their inheritance.

[1] As e.g. Swedenborg's mystical theory of the spheres; or the idea of some popular writers of successive stages of progressive life evolved by successive transportations from planet to planet; or the notion of Isaac Taylor (*Phys. Theory of Another Life*) of an invisible, although to some extent material, world or universe inside of the one cognizable to us, and "not connected by any active affinities" to this one; and others of a similar tendency, all of which ignore the believer's inheritance as promised by the Spirit (substituting their own conceived one in place of it), and by their vague, mystical conceptions deliberately reject God's *sworn* statement respecting it, making redemption, both of man and creation, from the curse incomplete.

[2] Science might have been added according to the lavish statements of Figuier (*The To-Morrow of Death*, ch. 3), who, after telling us that "the space above our atmosphere" is "heaven," adds that science corroborates what is asserted, viz., that "the most widespread modern religions—Christianity, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism—assign to heaven the home of God's chosen people." "So science, tradition, and religion join hands in this matter; and the holy priest who, attending the royal martyr on the revolutionary scaffold, cried, 'Son of the holy St. Louis, ascend to heaven,' uttered a veritable scientific truth." This suggests how far the Church is indebted to outside views respecting the regions of the blessed—that is, to heathen mythology—for a departure from the primitive belief. The writer just quoted (Figuier) affirms, what others only conjectured, that the sun is the ultimate radiant home of the purified souls. That is the Father's house; thus reintroducing in another form *the ancient* regard for the sun. So. C. Bonnet (*Philosophic Palingenesis*), Dupont de Nemours (*The Philos. of the Universe*), and others have the saints passing from world to world, ascending to heaven, etc.; and the former locates the New Jerusalem forever in heaven (ignoring the promise that it shall descend to the earth), and adds to Christ's language, in John 14, "He will return and take us with Him, that we may be where He will be," etc., thus implying a leaving again after return. The poets need not be mentioned, and the reader perhaps is familiar with Dick's *Philos. of a Future State*, and kindred works, where the astronomical idea is developed.

Obs. 2. Let us endeavor to ascertain the scriptural meaning of "*Father's house.*" The word "*house,*" with Father, or God, or Lord, attached, in some places denotes the tabernacle; in other places the temple; and still in others the Church, because God is *specially present*, and these in *a special manner* belong unto Him. So Jerusalem, owing to its Theocratic relationship, containing the throne of David, being the

capital of the Messianic King, being the place where God will dwell again, etc., is called "*the house of the Lord*," Ps. 122, Zech. 8, etc., just as Nebuchadnezzar designated the city Babylon (Dan. 4 : 30) "*the house of the Kingdom.*" It is His "*habitation*" or "*dwelling-place*," because specially covenanted to Him, Ps. 132 : 13, 14 "*For the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever; here will I dwell for I have desired it*," etc. Here it is that God will again through His Son—who is also the promised seed of David to occupy (according to oath) David's throne—manifest his rulership. In the prophetic delineations, this idea of "*a house*," "*a dwelling-place*," etc., is inseparably connected with that of the Kingdom; that is, it is the house of the Kingdom in which the regal representations are exhibited, and to which all must look for the central place of dominion. It must not be separated from the Kingdom; it being the head of the Kingdom and designed for its establishment and perpetuation. So closely are the two united, that the Kingdom itself — flowing out of this "house" — is called "*the house*" that was found and left desolate by Jesus (Matt. 23 : 38 etc.) "*the tabernacle* of David fallen" and in ruins, or *the royal house* of David (called "*house*" and "*mine house*" i.e. adopted as God's in 2 Sam. 7 : 1 seq. and 1 Chron. 17 : 11–27) in an abject condition.[1] Or, to express ourselves more accurately, "*the house*" of David becoming God's "*house*" in virtue of His Son being incorporated to constitute *the Theocratic King* contemplated, it and the Kingdom are associated (comp. even Gen. 41 : 40) ideas, with which Jerusalem as the place of special royal manifestation and residence is annexed; the one virtually and necessarily recalling the other. This, therefore, explains why in the prophecies they are interchangeably used; the one suggesting and being contained in the other. The word "*house*" linked with God, naturally suggests *a particular relationship;* that He in some manner is identified with it; and this is fully sustained in the position that Jerusalem will occupy (as e.g. Zech. 8 : 3) in the restored Theocratic arrangement. This accounts for the praises, etc., lavished upon Jerusalem, the exalted place it becomes in the eyes of all nations, etc., but as these have been presented under Props. 168 and 169, nothing more need to be added. (The only objection, derived from Christ preparing a place, will be noticed below Obs. 5, and under Prop. 152, etc.) It now becomes necessary to verify the meaning that we have attached to "*the Father's house.*" Let us closely follow the guidings of Scripture and see the result. Turn e.g. to Micah 3 : 12 and Zion shall "be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest." Here the once favored city of God and the Kingdom is described as fallen. "*But* (Micah 4 : 1–3) *in the last days*" all this is to be changed; a restoration is asserted of *the same* Zion, *the identical* Jerusalem and mountain, and notice, it is expressly affirmed, when this restitution takes place, to be *God's* "*house*," in the expressions, "*the mountain of the house of the Lord*," *the house of the God of Jacob*," with the location definitely fixed in the words: "*for the law shall go forth of Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem*" (comp. Isa. 2 : 1–4 "*the mountain of the Lord's house*," etc.) No wonder that Jews acquainted with prophecy understood Jesus by "*the Father's house*" to refer to these very predictions where it is geographically portrayed (for evidence, see, e.g. *the opinion of the disciples*, who heard Jesus,

indirectly or rather directly given Acts 1 : 6)[2] Just as Jerusalem is called "*the throne of the Lord*" (Jer. 3 : 17), being "*the city of the great King,*" "*the city of our God*" (Ps. 48 : 1–2) "*the holy mountain*" and "*the mountain of the Lord of hosts*" (Zech. 8 : 3) "*a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God*" (Isa. 62 : 3) because "*the delight*" of God and married to Him (i.e. intimately united to Him)—so Jerusalem is designated "*the house of God,*" etc. The word "Father" joined to it specially recalled the fact that God the Father is there as promised ; that the Father (privately acknowledged) is the One that bestows (Dan. 7) "*the throne of the Lord*" upon the Son ; that He (by covenant) acknowledges David's Son as His Son ruling in His might so that *Theocratically* the Kingdom then established is properly named the Kingdom of the Father and also of the Son (comp. e.g. Matt. 26 : 29 ; Rev. 11 : 15 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 11, etc.). Hence the apostles and early Christians, placing these predictions in the future *at the Second Advent,* and well knowing that God the Father would again dwell in and "rejoice in Jerusalem" when "the new heaven and new earth" (Isa. 65 : 17–19) were created, thus making it His Habitation or House, could not interpret Christ's language in any other way than as applicable to that period. It was only when the direct prophecies relating to God's House in this sense were alleged to be fulfilled in this dispensation and Church (against existing fact, viz. that such supremacy, deliverance from war, suffering, etc., are not witnessed, and will not be down to the Sec. Advent), that men found it necessary to seek out *another meaning* for the predicted "House of the Lord." Let the student notice that John gives this promise of the Father's house *after* the determination of Judas to betray Him, and in view of His approaching death ; now if we turn to Luke, we find substantially *the same promise* given in other phraseology which corroborates our interpretation. In Luke 22 : 29, 30, Jesus appoints unto them a Kingdom as the Father appointed unto Him, etc., which when compared with Matt. 19 : 28 and other Scripture is, "*when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory.*" The spirit or intent of the promise is thus confirmed, and this will be strengthened by considering the numerous promises given to the righteous of inheriting, dwelling in, abiding in Jerusalem, this Lord's house in the future, and of their securing such extraordinary exemption from evils and the reception of positive blessings such as can only be attributed to the state of believers after the Advent.[3] The Father and the Christ being One, as John proceeds to state in the words of Jesus, shows—if faith is willing to accept of it—that "*the Father's house,*" and "*the Lord's house*" established at the Second Coming by the Mighty King, *are one and the same.* An overwhelming stream of prophecy indicates *the identity ;* and Jesus sustains it in *the most delicate manner* by calling it, in view of the relation that He sustains in the Theocratic order, "*the Father's house,*" which the prophets, in their relationship, did not directly employ, but substituted "*The house of the Lord,*" "*The city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel,*" etc. The only correct method of dealing with the passage under consideration is to regard it as *in unison* with the previously given statements concerning "*the Lord's house,*" which is to be witnessed and realized in all its glory in the renewed earth.[4]

[1] The Oriental usage must be observed in this connection, which represented a Kingdom under the figure of a "house," with the evident idea of presenting the notion of a

paternal government, a relationship of parent and children in the headship and obedience, etc. It is only necessary to direct attention e.g. to Heb. 3 : 2, 5, 6, where it is asserted that Moses was faithful in his "house," or government or headship over the children of Israel, and so Christ also has a "house," a government or headship, which "house" we, if persevering to the end, shall become, i.e. having reference to our associated rulership with Christ, being exactly equivalent to Luke 12 : 32, etc. The *Ency. Relig. Knowledge*, in art. "House," correctly observes that owing to a house being for dwelling and a tent being also for the same, they are called the same (beth) in Hebrew. The tabernacle of God, the tabernacle of David incorporated as His, is this house, and it is restored here upon the earth—for God dwells in it as Ruler, the Sovereign Head—it being a *Theocratic House.*

[2] From explanations previously given, it is unnecessary to stop and argue that e.g. "mountain" denotes Kingdom, for even our opponents fully admit this when, in their own way, they make Micah and Isaiah descriptive of the Kingdom of the Messiah. But that it is thus employed the reader can verify by reference to Isa. 25 : 6, 7 ; Dan. 2 : 35 ; Ezek. 17 : 23 ; Isa. 41 : 15, etc. The latter (Daubuz, *Perp. Com.*, quotes) a Targum renders : "Thou shalt slay the people and shalt consume the kingdoms (i.e. mountains); thou shalt make them as stubble." Lord, in reply to Berg, says that "mountain" is not used as a Kingdom, but symbolically to designate "the rulers who exercise the government over the State, not the State itself, as a mountain is part of the earth that is largely elevated above the lower portions that surround it." While we are inclined to think that "mountain" is sometimes used for Kingdom, yet it is also, as Lord states, employed to designate *the ruling authority*, the places of power and authority, the high places of a Kingdom. And thus it seems to be employed in Isa. 2 and Mic. 4, or otherwise we have a redundancy in the expression, viz., the Father's house is already the Kingdom as established at Jerusalem, and the mountain must be descriptive of the ruling authority, which is thus exalted above all others. Lord's idea coincides with the one here advanced, since Jerusalem is the place of manifested royalty, the representative of the ruling authority, the centre of the widespread dominion. As a contrast we refer to the Father of modern deviations, Origen, who (*Ag. Celsus*) makes, in Isa. 2, the mountain of the Lord to be the Word ; the house to be the Church ; the tops of the mountains to be the predictions of the prophets ; the hills to be individuals who make a profession of superior attainments in wisdom, etc.

[3] It is this feature which forms the key-note of many passages. Thus, e.g. the barren woman "*dwelling* (marg.) *in a house*," Ps. 113 : 9, "they shall be abundantly satisfied *with the fatness of thy house*," etc., Ps. 36 : 8 (with which compare feast of Isa. 25, etc.). So also Ps. 84 : 4, 10 ; Ps. 58 : 2 ; Isa. 56 : 5 ; Ps. 65 : 4 ; Isa. 60 : 7, etc.

[4] The reader is reminded (as indicative of the use of the word "house") that in this Jerusalem—this "house of the Lord"—which belongs to God in virtue of its *Theocratic* relationship, there is to be another "house" or "building," called "a spiritual house," 1 Pet. 2 : 4–10 ; "God's building," 1 Cor. 3 : 9 ; "house of God," 1 Tim. 3 : 15 ; 1 Pet. 4 : 17. This "house" is incorporated with the other, forming, Eph. 2 : 19–22, "an Holy Temple in the Lord," "for the habitation of God through the Spirit." It is so designated because forming that "royal priesthood," etc., who "in the ages to come" shall show forth "the exceeding riches of His grace," etc. How this "house" is connected is shown under various propositions.

Obs. 3 In this "house" are "*many mansions.*" Commentators inform us that the word translated "mansions" may denote either the act of dwelling, or the place where one dwells, or a station or position occupied therein. It is of little consequence which idea is intended, for either one of them imply that in this house the saints will dwell possessing stations of honor and glory. How this *accords* with the descriptions relating to the capital of the Coming Theocratic Kingdom, need not be repeated after the intimations already given. But the reader will notice that these disciples are encouraged with the hope of being *specially near* to Him *in the very place* of royal manifestation, which is explained in other passages as sitting upon thrones and judging the twelve tribes of Israel, agreeably to the Theocratic ordering. "Many" gives an assurance of sufficiency, and, perhaps, as some think, of "grades" agreeably to 1 Cor. 15 : 40, 41.

Tertullian (*On the Res.*, ch. 41) says the many mansions "may possibly be understood of the domicile of this world." A remark may be appropriately added: These "mansions," while "many," still are only designed for a certain class, viz., the elect. The number of kings and priests is determined; only so many, and no more, are to become such; and hence also the number of crowns and mansions are determined for the same. This is a peculiar, separate, exalted people specially formed for His name, who are associated with Christ in the administrations of the Theocratic Kingdom. These are now in process of being gathered out of the nations. Let us see to it that we shall be among those so highly honored. If believers, let us be careful lest some other man take the mansion that we can attain unto; for it is just as true of the mansion as it is of the crown (the latter being equivalent to or including the former), Rev. 3 : 11, "to hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." No crown, no mansion. How terrible, how remorseful, if another man take the position, the dwelling-place, so happy, exalted and glorious, once offered to me and within my reach.

Obs. 4. "*If it were not so, I would have told you.*" Here Jesus appeals to His own truthfulness. The student will please observe the force of this reference. (1) It takes *for granted* that the disciples *after* having preached this Father's house, *after* having identified it with the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom—understood the nature of this house and anticipated places of honor and glory in it. Hence the expressive: "*If it were not so,*" i.e. if you believed wrong—if your faith and hope were erroneous, etc. (2) Jesus *confirms* them in their expectations of *the ultimate restoration* of this Theocratic "Father's house," in the words: "*I would have told you.*" By this expression He affirms that He would not, as a faithful Teacher, leave them, if misapprehending the truth, under a mistake. He would enlighten them. The *honesty* of Jesus is involved in this matter. If the disciples were wrong in their view of the Father's house, *then* it was the place of the Divine Teacher not to leave them in the continued (see Acts 1 : 6) belief that it related to the Theocratic ordering. (See this matter discussed, Props. 43, 69, 70, 71, etc.) (3) If the modern notions engrafted on this passage are correct, *then* it follows that there ought to have been a complete revulsion in the views of the disciples, seeing that the popularly received interpretations of the Father's house are utterly antagonistic to the idea of a restored Theocratic-Davidic house—once under the special relationship of the Father. But such a change of meaning *never resulted* under apostolic preaching (Props. 70, 71) as seen in the belief (Props. 72, 73, 74, 75, 76) of the early Church. Our interpretation vindicates, therefore, the integrity of Jesus, the knowledge of inspired teachers, and the belief of the Primitive Church.

Obs. 5. "*I go to prepare a place for you.*" By this going Jesus embraces His death and ascent to heaven; and includes the provision made for salvation, such as securing His own power over death (i.e. becoming David's immortal Son, capable of meeting and fulfilling the terms of the covenant) to rescue others, His acknowledgment by the Father in exaltation, etc. By thus preparing a place for you, He evidently refers to the same inheritance that Peter speaks of (1 Pet. 1 : 4–7) "*reserved in heaven,*" but "*ready to be revealed in the last time,*" "*at the appearing of Jesus Christ;*" or, to the New Jerusalem, the special home of the ransomed, which John tells us (Rev. 21) at the creation of "the new heaven and new earth," "*comes down, from God, out of heaven,*" and which, as we have shown (Prop. 169) is most intimately connected with, joined to, the earthly Jerusalem, giving to the latter its inexpressibly great glory.

No one doubts that the New Jerusalem state, whatever it denotes, is related to this "*Father's house.*" But in strict conformity with our doctrine, when the time comes for this Father's house (Theocratic capital) to be restored in its contemplated grandeur and predicted splendor, this New Jerusalem "*descends out of heaven from God,*" upon an earth from which the curse is repealed, forming—owing to its preparation—the great object of attraction, power, honor, and magnificence *identified* with that "house." The stations, places, or mansions, determined previously, are bestowed upon those who are worthy of them. But this by no means exhausts the meaning of the word "prepare." The careful student of the Word well knows how the Spirit—to whom time is nothing—in the largeness of his comprehension links things together which we, shortsighted and fettered by time, are apt to overlook. Jesus is *not only* the Divine Architect of the New Jerusalem, but in the full and complete preparation of the place for the Redeemed is *included* the creation of the New Heaven and New Earth, the restoration of the Theocratic Kingdom, the making of all things new. By going in the way appointed, He is the recognized authority to receive the Kingdom for which He makes preparation in heaven itself and completes it at His return. He is even engaged in preparing, i.e. qualifying, testing, etc., the believers for the places intended for them in the Father's house. The phraseology appears to intimate that the preparation is not immediately complete, but continuous, extending even to His Coming again.

The reader will observe that the expression, "prepare a place for you," forbids the engrafted Popish idea of this place being "the third heaven," the place where the Divine Sovereignty is specially manifested, seeing that such preparation implies that it did not *previously* exist, which cannot be said of the third heaven. Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 312) says that the going to prepare denotes "His directing the events which are to issue in its full establishment," and while inclined to accept of this we make it to include much more. (Comp. Alford, Lange, etc., *loci.*)

Obs. 6. We now come to the clause which is supposed to militate the most against our view, viz. "*I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also.*" Some commentators tell us that by this Coming again, etc., is meant His Coming *by death* to remove saints to this "house." But this is opposed not only by the spirit of the passage and by parallel passages but even many of our opponents *themselves refuse* to accept it owing to its harshness. Being present *personally*, speaking of departing *personally*, the Coming again must also allude *to a personal Coming* or return ("*I am to come back,*" so Bloomfield). That He will come again personally is abundantly attested (Prop. 121). Jesus does not come in or through death; death being an enemy and penal in its character. Hence even Barnes (*Com.* Acts 1 : 11) while intentionally silent on the Coming again on John 14 : 3,[1] quotes it as a Coming "at the Day of Judgment. So also Bloomfield rejecting the notion of a Coming at death, indorses what he calls the interpretation "maintained by most ancient and earlier moderns, viz. as referring to the period of the Sec. Advent, and which he adds: "*Is placed beyond doubt by* 1 *Thess.* 4 : 16, *where the language of the apostle is the best comment on that of his Lord.*" The changing of the text, also to make it read: "I will return and take you with me" (Campbell's Transl. *Four Gospels*), thus making the impression that they are removed *from this earth*, is not sustained either by critics or the analogy of Scripture. When Jesus comes again,

He *remains upon* this earth; the Bible closes *with leaving* Him, the saints, and the New Jerusalem here, and it is *an unwarranted adding* to the Word, *a violation* of an oath-bound covenant, a removal of Him *from* His inheritance, throne of glory, and Theocratic Kingdom, to say that He is taken away, or goes away again from this "New Heaven and New Earth." Jesus comes again to restore the Theocratic Kingdom, and as the saints are associated with Him in rulership, they then receive the portions assigned them in this "Father's house." Hence, 2 Thess. 2 : 1, 2, etc., "*the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering unto Him*," are united. This Coming is itself dependent upon the completion of certain preparatory measures, such as: *until* the last one of the chosen, elect, determined number of saints is gathered out of this dispensation who are to be kings and priests in the Coming one; *until* the decreed consumption of the land and people has culminated to its closing; *until* the ordained times of Gentile domination are about accomplished. Then when all things are ready, "The Christ" comes, sent by the Father, One with the Father, to accomplish and perfect the Father's will, and in the place, selected in preference to all others, where *the Theocratic Presence* alone is vouchsafed, there will he receive His believing brethren that they may ever be with Him. The possession of this "house" is conditional on that Coming—so *all* the prophets, *all* the sacred writers. In the intermediate state the saints are waiting for the period of manifestation, when the reward, the crown, the inheritance, etc., is bestowed by the Theocratic King and they forever enter the enjoyment of their several "mansions" in "the everlasting Kingdom," of which the glorious "Father's House" forms the crowning head, adorned and ennobled by the descended New Jerusalem with which it is evermore One. Thus the Scriptures harmonize, making (instead of several and many localities and worlds, etc.) covenant promises, predictions, and doctrines *consistent one with the other*, referring to *one* period, *one* place, *one* great Kingdom, *one* magnificent royal city (the Old and the New in union) and *one* mighty King of kings swaying lordly dominion, as David's Son and Theocratic Ruler, over all the earth restored to the favor and blessing of the Father.[2]

[1] Although he afterward, on the words, "Ye may be also," says: "He would come again at the day of judgment, and gather all His friends to Himself, and they should be ever with Him," Heb. 9 : 28. His entire comment on Acts 1 : 11, "Shall so come," is the following: "At the day of judgment, John 14 : 3, 'If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again,'" etc. Brown (*Com.*, John 14) makes no attempt to explain the Father's house, and on the phrase, "I will come again and receive you unto myself," he says: "*Strictly*, at His personal appearing; but in a secondary sense, to each individually" (evidently meaning by the last death, with which opinion the reader is desired to contrast his own strong protest against it in his "Christ's Sec. Coming," quoted by us, Prop. 121). Origen, Calvin, Lampe, Meyer, Luthardt, Brückner, Ewald, and many others refer this Coming again to the still future personal Parousia of Jesus, which is far more consistent with the analogy of Scripture than to make this Coming that of the Spirit (Neander, Godet, etc.) or that of death (Grotius, Knapp, Reuss, etc.).

[2] Taking the Spirit's description of this "house," we have something real, tangible; something that mind and heart can grasp; something adapted to the longings and aspirations of fallen humanity; something in accord with man in his individual, social, and national relations; something consistent with a perfected recovery from the fall, instead of an ethereal, unearthly, distant something that no one can describe, no one can tell where it exists, etc. The Coming again of Jesus, as held by us, is confirmed by another class of passages, as 1 Cor. 11 : 26; Heb. 9 : 27, 28, etc. In brief, a multitude of writers (like Schmid, *Bib. Theol. N. T.*, p. 222) refer this Coming to the Sec. Advent, which alone accords with general analogy. In reference to the misapplication of this passage to

death, by which so many are led astray, it is sufficient to quote the pointed affirmation of our leading opponent, Dr. Brown, who (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, ch. 2) not only concedes, but defends our application of the passage. He argues that death cannot, without undue violence, be transmuted in Christ's Coming, and quotes this Scripture as follows : " ' Let not your heart be troubled (said Jesus to His sorrowing disciples) : in my Father's house are many mansions ; I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go away '—what then ? ' Ye shall soon follow me ? Death shall shortly bring us together ? ' Nay : but '*If I go away, I will come again and receive you unto myself : that where I am, there ye may be also,*' John 14 : 1–3. ' And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel ; which also said, " Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven, *this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall* "—what ? ' Take you home soon to Himself, at death ? ' Nay ; but shall ' *so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into Heaven,*' " Acts 1 : 10, 11.

Obs. 7. To indicate the line of argument adopted by others, we present an epitome, with added remarks of ours in parenthesis, from the more recent and interesting work of Dr. D. W. Clark, entitled *Man all Immortal.* In the chap., ' Heaven" (chap. 16) after correctly insisting upon it " that heaven is real as earth is real," he directs attention to what he calls, the " types of heaven." These are (1) Eden ; (if Eden is a *type*, then Eden is not to be regained, and Satan has succeeded *in defrauding* the race of its original grant. A substitution of something else, is not Paradise restored. Hence the Bible begins with an earthly Paradise lost, and ends with *the same* restored with added blessings). (2) Canaan ; (but this is pure imagination ; it is nowhere asserted, excepting by men mystically inclined. More : Canaan is *expressly promised* (Prop. 219) to the Patriarchs and their seed ; they are to be raised up to inherit it ; this dispensation closes with Jesus and His saints in it, as the central part of the Kingdom.) (3) Jerusalem ; (but this is never proclaimed as a type ; what is said of Canaan in a great measure applies here.) (4) " Heaven is typically represented by the temple and the Church" (but the temple and the Church only represent an ordering or future arrangement). (5) " In an especial sense was the Holy of Holies a type of heaven ; (yes but only of the third heaven as it stands related to the sacrificial work, Heb. 9 : 24, to Christ, and not to the inheritance of the saints ; the saints were never allowed to enter it, etc.). (6) " The house and the family are also used as types of the heavenly place and relations ;" (they simply afford illustrations to indicate future relationship in the inheritance but are no types of the inheritance itself). (7) " The Sabbath is also made to symbolize heaven ;" (this is a mistake ; it does not symbolize the place, but only the time of inheritance, the coming rest in it, and the worship and enjoyments pertaining to it). Next Clark presents what he calls " figures employed to represent heaven." Here again he falls into error ; for among these figures he designates " *Place*" " City," " Building," " Kingdom," " Country," " Inheritance." But these actually and really describe *what exists*, for heaven is " a place," Clark himself calling it " a local habitation ;" it contains " a City," the " Building" of God ; it really possesses " a Kingdom," located in " a country," and which is actually " inherited." Thus taking his own admissions, these are not figures, i.e. a mere tropical representation. When he comes to discuss the locality of heaven, he adopts Dr. Dick's notion of making " heaven the astronomic centre of the material universe," and this view, he admits, is based solely *on probability*, saying : " the exact locality of heaven, in relation to the earth, the Scriptures do not fix ; but they do refer to it as

occupying a place in the universe." Dr. Dick and others are approvingly quoted. Now in relation to a mere admitted supposition, let it be suggested : (1) that a confounding of two things is apparent. The central part of the universe, which may indeed be the special place of the manifestation of the Father, is mistaken for the inheritance of the saints, forgetting that from this heaven of the Father the holy city comes to this earth, and that the Father is represented by, and seen in, His reigning Son when here ; (2) that while the exact locality of the third heaven is not given, the exact locality of the future inheritance of the saints is presented ; (3) that the Primitive Church for three centuries had no doubt respecting their inheritance, believing that the Scriptures did locate the place, even here on earth ; (4) that this theory ignores the promises pertaining to this earth, the promises made to Christ, the promises based on the covenants ; (5) that it is derogatory to the Word to believe, that Christ's inheritance and that of the saints, so specifically given, cannot be ascertained i.e., in locality. Dr. Clark briefly refers to our view (p. 445) quoting Dr. Griffin as teaching that this earth purified and refurnished shall be the inheritance of the saints, saying : "It has received the sanction of many learned and pious men." But he adds : "It is in many respects a grand idea, and it is countenanced by some beautiful analogies ; but, after all, it is unproved." The objections he urges in the briefest manner against us as "insuperable" are the following : (1) "The surface of the earth would be insufficient for the habitation of so great a number ;" (all this is fully answered elsewhere ; besides the reader will notice that it is a mere human deduction). (2) "Then, too, heaven is represented as the home of not only the saints, but also of the angels of God, and of Christ and God Himself ;" (this scarcely needs a reply, seeing that all Millenarians, ancient and modern, have the renewed earth and the third heaven intimately united, Jacob's dream verified, and God ruling in Christ). (3) "Then again, it is referred to as a building, a city, a Kingdom already prepared ;" (this is overlooking (1) what may be prepared and what is in course of preparation, placing together in time what God has separated ; and (2) that things still future in view of their certainty, are spoken of as present or realized by anticipation ; and (3) that God's determination to accomplish a certain thing, in view of His all sufficiency, etc., is alluded to as an accomplished fact.) We are profoundly glad, in view of the covenants, the promises to inherit the earth, the deliverance of creation from the curse, etc., that such a talented writer as Dr. Clark could not urge stronger objections. In the light of the Word, they are of no moment. These have been answered under various Props., so that a refutation, at length, is unnecessary.

Briefly, the statements of others may be contrasted. It is almost a caricaturing of the promise to make (as Martensen, *Ch. Dog.*, p. 348) the universal Church "the Father's House," and the many mansions : "these various confessions must be looked upon as various chambers, various dwellings in the house of the one Lord." As the word "house" has a variety of applications, it must here be interpreted to suit *the analogy* of Scripture respecting the inheritance of the saints—as something separate and distinct from the saints themselves—as something which they inherit. That class of our opponents who concede a future inheriting of the earth virtually concede the correctness of our interpretation. Surely the Scriptures are *not antagonistic* concerning the place inherited. Hence we must reject Keerl's (*His. Creation and Doc. of Paradise*) opinion that the universe is God's house and the fixed stars the many mansions, or MacDonald's (*My Father's House : or the Heaven of the Bible*) view that "the third heaven" is thus designated, simply because these are *never promised* to the saints as their inheritance or

reward, or Kingdom in which they reign. Lincoln (*Lects. on Rev.*), although a Pre-Millenarian, misapplies this promise to the third heaven, thus *ignoring covenant and promise;* and feeling an incongruity, he says (vol. 2, p. 11): "The Father's house precedes, in point of time, the judgment seat of Christ and the Kingdom of the Son of man." It does neither; for it contains the throne of the Christ, and is itself the Kingdom of the Son of man; and being once obtained remains to every saint *an ever-abiding* possession. Beecher, in a sermon on "The Future State," based on John 14 : 1-4, takes it for granted that this house refers to the third heaven, and not *the slightest proof* is vouchsafed for such an assumption. Then a second unfounded supposition is engrafted upon the first one, viz., that by death we enter this house and the mansions, the coming again of Jesus and the receiving being thus interpreted: "I think you will see Christ; but you will see Him on the other side. *You will go to Him, He will not come to you*" (thus reversing the phraseology of the text; see *Chr. Union*, Sept. 5th, 1877). A writer in the *Princeton Review* (Ap., 1855, p. 274 etc.) defines (1) "the Father's house" to be the entire created universe, embracing "heaven;" (2) the "many mansions" are descriptive of "space sufficient to accommodate innumerable companies;" (3) the place prepared is the third heaven, and this preparation was made when Jesus "went into heaven in a glorified human nature, as the great High Priest of the Church, to present as it were His own blood, and take possession, as their Forerunner, of *the promised inheritance.*" "It is His interceding work, in the presence of God, which has already prepared heaven for His people;" and hence, He informs us, He comes to them at death and brings them to heaven, and then also comes at the resurrection and takes them back to heaven; (4) He, then, concedes a renewed earth to arise, but, not knowing exactly what to do with it *in his system* of eschatology, he hesitatingly adds: "Does it follow that this earth is to be the seat, the exclusive seat of heaven? We feel much inclined to the literal interpretation of the passage that it teaches that the present earth, after its predicted destruction, will come forth renewed; and yet we cannot hold that any such pre-eminence is to be assigned to it as that it shall become the exclusive seat or fixed bounded limit of heaven." We do not say "exclusive" heaven, but we do affirm their special, exclusive covenanted, predicted, and promised *inheritance.* We turn to another writer, G. S. Faber (*The Many Mansions in the House of the Father*), who makes the "house" to be "the real temple of the Omnipresent," or "the immense mundane house of God," i.e. the universe, and "the many mansions" are the many spheres, planetary and stellar, which astronomy reveals to us. But the place which our Lord promised to prepare for us is this earth (one of the mansions) restored to an Edenic or perfected condition, which the saints shall occupy after the Sec. Advent. This theory tries to unite the popular conception with the promises relating to the inheriting of the earth, but fails *in consistency*, simply because it is not founded on *a correct conception of the Theocratic Kingdom of the Lord Jesus.*

PROPOSITION 171. *This Kingdom is connected with the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and of Fire.*

That, at the time this Kingdom is established and during its continuance, the saints will be under *the special influence and power of the Spirit*, is clearly taught in many predictions. Even many of our opponents frankly admit that the Millennial descriptions can never be realized without *a remarkable, astounding and even miraculous outpouring of the Spirit*, exceeding everything that the world has ever witnessed. The careful student, weighing the promises on this subject, must, from a consideration of the passages teaching this, come to the same conclusion. It is reasonable, too, that *the same Spirit*, which exhibited its power in all great events, in periods of transition, should in the establishing of the Theocracy be *eminently conspicuous in this the culminating era* of its own glorious predictions and works.

Fausset (*Com.*, Isa. 2 : 3) remarks : "If the curse foretold against Israel has been literally fulfilled, so shall the promised blessing be literal. We Gentiles must not, while giving them the curse, deny them their peculiar blessing *by spiritualizing* it. The Holy Ghost shall be poured out for a general conversion then, Jer. 50 : 5 ; Zech. 8 : 21, 23 ; Joel 2 : 28." To this we add : In order to comprehend the greatness and glory of the coming Theocracy, we must locate the divine operations of the Holy Spirit as given in the divine record, and allow to them the extent as promised, both as they pertain to the Jews, the Gentiles, and the glorified saints. By limiting and transposing, the predictions are shorn of their beauty, consistency, and strength.

Obs. 1. To avoid misapprehension in what follows, it is proper to say, that we cordially adopt the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is the renewer and sanctifier, through the truth, of all who are redeemed, and that such renewing influences are necessary unto salvation. While accepting of the ordinary work of the Spirit in enlightening and sanctifying men, we do not find that this comes under the phrase "*baptism of the Holy Ghost*," which rather denotes the bestowment of all other gifts, even the miraculous, *in connection* with the ordinary. The very phraseology evinces such *a lavish bestowment* of the Spirit, that the gifts which the apostle enumerates, as often more or less divided (1 Cor. 12 : 7–11), are bestowed upon the person thus "*filled*" or "*baptized*," to an unusual degree. Passing over the Record, and carefully noticing the cases of *such baptism* with their results, will prepare us to appreciate the Proposition and guard us against the misapplication of language and facts *so prevalent* at the present day.

We have to-day ten thousand works which, unable to discriminate between the ordinary and extraordinary operations of the Spirit, urge us to "pray for the baptism of the Holy Ghost" to be experienced at present. Certain religious bodies, deserving credit for insisting upon the believer's dependence upon the Divine Spirit, run into an extreme by adopting this phrase as a familiar one to designate present experience. See Obs. 7 and note. In commentaries, sermons, etc., we are exhorted to repent and believe so that

we, at present, may receive the Holy Spirit as given on the day of Pentecost, which is designated a " Pentecostal shower," etc.

Obs. 2. John the Baptist predicts that the One Coming after him, even Jesus Christ, " *shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*" (Matt. 3 : 11 ; Mark 1 : 8 ; Luke 3 : 16 ; John 1 : 33 ; Acts 1 : 5). Leaving the baptism of fire for a following observation, and confining ourselves to that of the Holy Ghost, it may be stated that according to Acts 1 : 5, whatever influences and power Jesus bestowed upon the disciples and His apostles from the time of John to His ascension, this *specific* baptism of the Spirit was not supposed to be conferred, for it is asserted that to fulfil this promise of John's, and to be endued with power from on high, they must remain at Jerusalem *until* the Comforter came," *for John truly baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.*" Hence the phrase is only used by way of promise in the Gospels.[1] The apostles who were to be favored with this baptism had *previously* experienced the ordinary operations of the Spirit, for as Christ's prayer indicates (John 17 : 16–20), they were *already renewed* men, worthy believers, who having " *received*," " *kept*," and " *believed* " the Word were acknowledged as His brethren, and who in their preaching and labors had been remarkably sustained by the Spirit, before obtaining this *special baptism* on the day of Pentecost. The baptism then must include *something more* than the production of " piety," " worship," " religious principles"—in brief, than the characteristics of a divine life.[2] In turning to the account of the actual reception of this baptism, it is found to embrace the reception of *miraculous gifts and powers*, such as the imparting supernaturally the understanding of truth, the prophetic spirit, the speaking with other tongues, the working of miracles, etc. Of course, with *such a portrayal* of what constitutes the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we dare *not limit* it to anything *less* than such an experience. And in this we are sustained, if we find all other instances, in which such a baptism is mentioned as given *comporting* with the one realized by the apostles. In Acts 8 : 5–24, we have another account of other persons who were *already believers*, having been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, and *afterward* obtained this baptism through which they received *miraculous power*, it being *a special, added* blessing. So in Acts 10 : 44–46, the Holy Ghost fell on *the believers* bestowing supernatural power, and this Peter, Acts 11 : 15–17, calls the baptism of the Holy Ghost, saying : " *then remembered I the Word of the Lord, how that He said : John indeed baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost*," etc. The uniform testimony of Scripture, wherever the baptism itself is described, is, that it was not designed for the renewing of the heart and conferring of Christian graces (whatever influence it may have exerted in confirming faith and its fruits) but *for the bestowal of supernatural power and endowments.* The reader, if he wishes more proof, can find additional instances in Acts 19 : 6 ; Heb. 2 : 4 ; Acts 5 : 32 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 12 ; Acts 15 : 8 ; Rom. 15 : 18, etc. The fact is *indisputable* that believers who had been baptized and were acknowledged Christians had by this baptism supernatural power *added* to their other attainments. It is therefore *equivalent* to the conferring of such power.[3]

[1] A mistake made by some writers (as e.g. Sturges) in making the command to baptize in the name of the Holy Ghost, Matt. 28 : 19, an equivalent to receiving " the baptism of the Holy Ghost" is so self-evident, that it only deserves mention to indicate its inconsis-

tency in designating the act performed by another *only* in the name of the Spirit to be the performance of the Spirit itself, etc.

[2] Hence, undoubtedly Olshausen misapprehends this baptism, when he makes it to be the ordinary work of "the inward cleansing in faith, the Spirit being conceived of as the regenerating principle." So also Kendrick when he spiritualizes it, making the baptism merely indicative of Christ's ministry, being "more profoundly searching and spiritual." The same mistake occurs in Barnes, etc., who make it equivalent to the ordinary regenerating operations of the Spirit on the heart and life of men, only to a greater extent. Some (as e.g. the *Christian Union.*, July 11th, 1877), would even limit John 14 : 12—"the greater works"—to the moral and spiritual as exhibited in Luther, Wesley, Moody, etc. A Roman Catholic version, given by Dr. Rutter (*Life of Jesus*, p. 102), follows the same : "'He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and the fire' of His divine love, in order to purify you from your sins." Various commentaries make the same mistake, owing to a lack of comparison of Scripture on the subject.

[3] An honored friend, the same to whom this work is dedicated, suggests that another reason which evinces the distinction here maintained is the fact, that the apostles themselves exhorted their followers to desire and covet the ordinary renewing operations before those of the extraordinary or miraculous, and that they intimate that the one can exist without the other. To this may be added : the reason why such a distinction exists, lies in the truth, that the ordinary *must precede* in order *to qualify* us for this future baptism, and the apostles well knowing that all who believe and become heirs will eventually experience it in a greater measure than then witnessed, lay the greater stress on the necessary and important antecedent *preparatory* work. Every believer is *now* in the chrysalis state of grace, but *then* in the perfected state.

Obs. 3. The question arises whether this Baptism of the Holy Ghost *as promised by John*, was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost and afterward. The answer is that it was a fulfilment of Acts 1 : 5 containing a promise given *personally* to the apostles but only *a partial inchoate* fulfilment of the other, seeing that the Lord manifested in comparatively *a few* persons what He proposes hereafter to bestow upon *all* the believing brethren associated with Him. The Baptism of Pentecost is a *pledge* of fulfilment in the future, *evidencing* what the Holy Ghost will *yet perform* in the coming age. The proof of its inchoate nature is seen in the following : (A) John's promise extends to the believers baptized by himself, and some of these, but *not all*, experienced this peculiar, distinguishing Baptism. For if narrowly scanned it embraces the idea of *universality* as given by Joel in his prediction. The Baptism of the apostles and others was indeed a realization of Joel's prophecy, but only in *a few* individuals thus leaving out the universality predicted. Many of our opposers admit that Peter in Acts 2 : 15–20 cites Joel "only in the way of application," but we, conceding even more than application, viz., a real fulfilment on a smaller scale than delineated by the prophet, view this as *an earnest* of what is yet to come. God's Word will be fulfilled, every prediction will find its mate, and with this principle, it is impossible to regard Joel's prediction *exhausted, or fully mated* in the events of Pentecost. For the prophecy embraces events, that we know *never* took place when the apostles received this baptism, such as a continued prediction relating to *one period* of time demands. Thus, e.g. there was no complete overthrow of anti-Christian powers, no such restoration of the Jews to their own land, no such fruitfulness of the land, no unexampled peace and prosperity, no blessedness of Millennial glory as Joel presents in connection. The reverse of all this followed : enemies triumphed, the nation was overthrown, the saints were persecuted, calamity and barrenness succeeded. The declaration that the Spirit shall be poured out "*upon all flesh*" includes more than was realized. For, fully admitting that the word "all" is used sometimes in a restricted sense, yet the

notion of universality, or at least of generality, is combined with it owing to this flesh including "*sons*," "*daughters*," "*the old men*," "*the young men*," "*the servants*," *and* "*the handmaids*." The outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost was confined, at most, to a few (how many were gathered is not known, Beza and others, following some MSS., think that the apostles were alone included; others embrace more), and afterward only a small proportion comparatively, of the increasing number of believers received these *miraculous* powers. Hence if fulfilled at all in the spirit and general affusion promised, it must relate *to the future*. In addition, Joel predicts that when this takes place, "*I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.*" Now it is admitted, even by those who are disposed to regard the baptism of the Holy Ghost as that given to all believers in the renewing and sanctifying influences, that if these wonders are "*to be limited to the day of Pentecost, it is certain that no such events occurred at that time*" (so e.g. Barnes, *Com.*, Acts 2 : 19), and they likewise acknowledge that these astonishing displays of God's power have not been witnessed down to the present day, and will *only* be seen at the period of the Sec. Advent.[1] Admissions like these so fully sustain our position, that it is unnecessary to show that such wonders, etc., *are related* to the day of the Son of Man, or Lord Jesus, at His Sec. Coming. To separate the baptism, a part of the prophecy, from the rest, and have it fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and the remainder at the Sec. Advent, is simply *an evasion and dislocating* of what the prophet has *joined together*. The reasons given are amply sufficient to show, that both John's and Joel's predictions still look onward *to a far more striking and illustrious fulfilment*. (B) This baptism was predicted (as by Joel, etc.), by the prophets before John (the latter only more concisely stating and applying to Jesus, and thus confirming what the former announced), to occur *in connection* with the restoration of the Theocracy and the ensuing Millennial era. This opens a wide field which we can only indicate. Take the context of Ezek. 36 : 27; Isa. 32 : 15; Ezek. 37 : 14; Isa. 44 : 3; Ezek. 39 : 29; Isa. 59 : 21, etc., and we invariably find the eye of faith pointed to a period *still future* when an *extraordinary* baptism of the Spirit shall be experienced. The *distinctive landmarks* (such as association with the restored nation and kingdom, and reign of David's Son, etc.), by which we recognize the occurrence of the outpouring, are so clearly given, that even a host of writers who differ from us, frankly confess, that these prophecies, *as they stand related*, are not yet fulfilled, and that we are fully warranted to look *for a Pentecostal baptism*, immensely superior in all respects still future and connected with the Millennium. This necessarily involves, seeing that the Pentecostal baptism is referred to by Peter as *an earnest or a specimen* of what the prophets predicted, a widely diffused and happily experienced *supernatural power*. No student, who examines the ancient prophecies, and notices the partial fulfilment, regarding the latter as explanatory of the meaning intended by the former, can come to any other conclusion. (C) This again is confirmed by *the analogy of faith*. The apostle in 2 Cor. 1 : 22; ch. 5 : 5; Eph. 1 : 14, tells believers that they have "*the earnest of the Spirit*," which implies that what they now realize through the Spirit is only *a kind of first-fruits or pledge* of what this same Spirit will perform in "the day of the Lord Jesus." For, in that day *both body and soul* shall experience this

remarkable baptism of the Spirit; the body in the Spirit's resurrecting, quickening, glorifying power (comp. Rom. 8 : 11; 2 Cor. 5 : 15; John 6 : 63; Eph. 1 : 13, and 4 : 20; 1 Pet. 3 : 18, etc.), and the soul in the Spirit's conferring wisdom, knowledge, utterance, prophecy, miraculous gifts, etc. And what is remarkable—observing that the ministrations of this Spirit varied in imparting to some more and to others less of this supernatural power—this outpouring of the Spirit is not to be confined to the saints who have "the earnest" (although their position, etc., indicates, as their glorification effectively proves, that they will be *specially* honored), for it extends to the Jewish nation (of which individual members were favored with a foretaste), and to the spared Gentile nations (of which Cornelius, and others, obtained the pledge), but even to the earth and its creatures in removing the curse, renewing and augmenting the original condition and destination of all things. The Spirit, as a creating and renewing agent, will be experienced *as widely* as the curse extended, the only exception being in the case of those who "rebelled against and vexed" this Spirit. (D) This feature is also noticeable, that, in the predictions relating to the Millennial period, this outpouring attains to *a perspicuity and outward prominence* so as to be witnessed by all. The fulfilment in part on the day of Pentecost, being distinctly regarded as of the same kind, unmistakably proves the correctness of this interpretation, and in every recorded instance of its reception *the same* is directly or indirectly affirmed. It was of such a nature that the persons under its influence were impelled to exhibit its power *publicly*, or in a manner to make it *cognizant* to others. It even in many cases manifested itself in a way that the very mode of influence was indicative of something supernatural. The baptism was bestowed in *a special manner*, and was regarded as *a special favor added* to the ordinary ones given by the same Spirit. God directly favored some with its communication, but others could not possibly receive it *without special provision*. Thus e.g. Philip preached in Samaria, and, having himself experienced this baptism, performed *miracles* in attestation of the truth. Now although he possessed these gifts, and many became believers through his instrumentality, yet he could not (and God did not), confer this *particular* baptism without *the special* mission and prayers of Peter and John—thus indicating that it was something *widely different* from the ordinary operations of the Spirit given to form and develop Christian character, and showing, when received, that it was of a nature which arrested attention and produced astonishment on account of the *outward characteristics* belonging to it. Hence, Acts 5 : 32; Heb. 10 : 15, not the apostles alone are witnesses but the Holy Ghost Himself. This alone then, when the prophecies relating to the future are verified, satisfactorily explains some of *the wonderful exhibitions* of power and glory which are connected with this Kingdom.[2]

[1] Some writers, not seeing how they diminish the force of the prophecies, make "the dark day" (experienced in the early history of our country, May 19th, 1780), and the notable falling of meteors (witnessed in Nov., 1833), to be a fulfilment of Joel and Matt. 24 : 29. They forget that these special signs, as Matt. indicates, follows "immediately *after*, the tribulation," i.e., it does *not precede* them. Those things which they take for "signs," are indeed such as they evince that the powers of nature are under a control beyond man's power of knowledge, and what God can do when the time arrives for fulfilment, but they are not the signs given by Joel, Matthew, etc. The application of Joel (and Mal. 4 : 5, 6) to the destruction of Jerusalem and the overthrow of the Jewish polity (e.g. by Brown in *Christ's Sec. Coming;* Henderson in *Minor Prophets*, etc.), necessarily

leaves out of the fulfilment much that is predicted (as if it were Oriental exaggeration), that multitudes, not Pre-Millenarian extend the ultimate complete fulfilment in the future (as Calvin, Howe, etc.). Fausset (*Com. loci*) unhesitatingly locates this at the future restoration of the Jews, saying : " That the promise is *not restricted* to the first Pentecost appears from Peter's own words : ' The promise is (not only) unto you and to your children (but also) *to all that are afar off* (both in space and in time), even as many as the Lord our God shall call ' (Acts 2 : 39). So here ' upon all flesh.' "

[2] This, of course, will enable the reader to discriminate between the opinions of men and the Scriptural idea. In many most excellent (i.e. containing valuable truths) discourses on the Holy Spirit, is to be found a lack of discrimination (as e.g. in Barrow's *Sermons*, vol. 2, p. 137, etc.), which vitiates much that is stated. Men are exhorted to seek that now (viz., " the Baptism of the Holy Ghost"), which only pertains to the future ; and that which a comparison of Scripture clearly separates and distinguishes, these join together in a confusion of ideas. The latter process being so popular both in the pulpit and the pew, and being allied with those who have much to say of a spirituality obtained by such a baptism, it is difficult even to secure attention to a serious consideration of this subject. The " Perfectionists" have much to say of this experienced (by them) " Baptism." The Quakers (see *Summary of Faith* by Jos. Gurney, etc., attached to vol. 3, Mosheim's *Ch. His.*) assert that the prophecy of Joel is " a peculiar mark of this dispensation ;" and locating its fulfilment in the present necessarily, from their premise, base upon it a variety of inferences and corresponding practice relating to the ministry, revelations, etc. Taking Joel isolated from its immediate connection, and refusing to regard the fulfilment on the Day of Pentecost merely inchoate, they make it a foundation for a series of inferential doctrines. The same is true of many others, and it is a sad fact that men and women claim through this alleged conference of " the Baptism of the Holy Spirit," to possess *a special* enlightenment which directed them into an interpretation of Scripture. It is consolatory to those who make no such pretensions and loud professions, that they evidence the falsity of their position by the blunders made in interpretation and application. All that are mystically inclined, exaggerate and eulogize the present dispensation and present individual experience in order to bring out, if possible, a fulfilment of Joel and kindred passages. Two extremes are to be avoided : the Montanistic idea (Neander, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 526), of a continuous fulfilment of all that Joel predicted at the present ; and the view of some antagonists that a complete and final fulfilment was found on the Day of Pentecost. Our view is a medium between these, and is based on *the general analogy* of Scripture. We prefer Olshausen's declaration (*Com.*, Acts 2 : 17, 21) : " the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, powerful and mighty as it was, is yet characterized as a *partial* effusion ; so that the prediction of Joel in its original form *still remains for the future.*" Dr. Nägelsbach (Lange's *Com.*, Isa. 32 : 15 ; Hom. 7) justly observes : " When once the Spirit of God is poured out on all flesh (Joel 2 : 28), *then* the personal and impersonal creation will be glorified. *Then* Satan will be bound, and the Lord alone will rule in men, and in nature. *Then* at last it will be beautiful on earth. For *then* right and righteousness will reign on earth, and peace, and that rest that is promised to the people of God, (Heb. 4 : 9)." For the student we quote Faber's (*Diss. on Proph.*, p. 79, footnote) remarks on Acts 2 : 16, 17 : " it (i.e. prophecy of Joel) is undoubtedly *applied* by St. Peter to the miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the Day of Pentecost ; yet it is as undoubtedly cited by him *only in the way of application.* The whole prophecy, of which that text forms a part, relates to the ravages of some fierce and lawless people symbolized by a flight of locusts, the restoration of the Jews, the overthrow of Antichrist and his congregated vassals between the two seas in the valley of concision, and the glorious rest of the people of God during the blessed days of the Millennium ; consequently it can only be *applied* by St. Peter to the times of *the First Advent* of our Lord, as typical in some measure of the times of his *Second Advent.* It ought to be observed, that, although *in his citation of the text,* the apostle introduces the phrase of *the last days* (which undoubtedly in his application of it means *the times of Christianity*), the phrase does not occur *in the original text* of Joel ; no argument, therefore, can be drawn from this circumstance to prove, that the Old Test. phrase *the end of days* is equivalent to the New Test. phrase of *the last days.*" We only add, commentators too readily jump to the conclusion that because of Peter's amendment of Joel, " afterward " must be equivalent to " in the last days," and thus overlook the connection of " afterward " in the original prediction. Faber, also, is too sweeping, when he declares that Peter's phrase must necessarily mean " the times of Christianity ;" it rather denotes—being employed previously to—what the same expression means in Heb. 1 : 2, the closing period of the Jewish dispensation.

Obs. 4. As intimated, the phrase "*baptism of the Holy Ghost*" conveys the idea of *a copious, abundant, remarkable bestowment of the Spirit.* It is a being "*filled with Spirit*" so that some of the wonder-working power of the mighty Spirit manifests itself through the person thus filled. We see this stated wherever in the Bible such a representation of being filled with the Spirit is given. Does the Spirit rest on the Elders (Num. 11 : 25, 26), then they prophesy; does it come upon Balaam (Num. 24 : 2), upon Saul (1 Sam. 10 : 10), or even upon his messengers (Num. 19 : 20), or upon David (2 Sam. 23 : 2), or upon the prophets (Acts 28 : 25; Neh. 9 : 30; Ezek. 7 : 12, etc.), then they predicted; was John filled with the Holy Ghost (Luke 1 : 15), or Elizabeth (Luke 1 : 41), or Mary (Luke 1 : 35), or Zecharias (Luke 1 : 67), or Simeon (Luke 2 : 25, 26), or Agabus (Acts 9 : 28), or the disciples (Luke 12 : 12), it in every instance exerted *a supernatural* influence in imparting knowledge of the future, etc. But in all this must be considered the fact, that in these cases the Spirit was given "*by measure*" (John 3 : 34), i.e. restricted to one or several particulars only, while the specially promised baptism, still given "by measure," included more in the same persons than had been *previously* bestowed, as seen in the case of the apostles and others, who not only predicted, not only understood their own predictions, not only obtained visions and constant instructions, but were under such a continued influence that they performed "*mighty signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God,*" (Rom. 15 : 18); so that God bore to them "*witness with signs and wonders and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost*" (Heb. 2 : 4). In the case of the disciples, it is expressly intimated, that whatever of supernatural power was communicated by the Spirit previously to the day of Pentecost, it was not the bestowment of that "measure" of the Spirit's power afterward received. This then leads the student, if wise, to consider, that if the Spirit is given by "measure" to men to suit certain exigencies, etc. (Christ only being excepted, John 3 : 24); and if that "measure" was increased to such an extent that it can be truly called "*a baptism,*" surely then when those stupendous events connected with "the appearing and the Kingdom" are regarded, it is most reasonable to anticipate, as holy men have predicted, *an increase of measure,* a far more extended manifestation of the Spirit's almighty energy, etc.

It is a sad fact that men have rashly antedated this period, and have ascribed to themselves what belongs to a future age. Thus to additionally illustrate: The Romish Church professes to give the Holy Ghost as e.g. in Confirmation (*The Path to Paradise*, p. 223, approved by Archb. Hughes, in which "Confirmation is a sacrament by which the faithful receive the Holy Ghost by the prayer and imposition of the hands of the Bishop," etc., quoting Acts 8 : 14–17 in proof.) One of the ordinances of the Mormons is "the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost." This feature has been fearfully perverted, as e.g. in the fanatics Storch, Stubner, Thomas, Munzer, etc. (D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, vol. 3, p. 55, etc.), by the Bohemian woman Wilhelmina (hence "the Wilhelminians," see *Encyps.*) who professed such a baptism and that the Holy Ghost became incarnate in her. The leaders of sects professed this baptism as e.g. Jemima Wilkinson (1776), Joanna Southcott (1792), Ludivic Muggleton (time of Cromwell), the "Men of Understanding" (1511), Anna Lee (1770), Joan Leadly (beginning of 18th century). It is made a prominent factor in various sects as e.g. with the "Camisards or French Prophets" (art. on *Ency. Relig. Knowl.*), the "Duchobortze, or Wrestlers of the Spirit" (art. on *Ency. Relig. Knowl.*), and with mystically inclined sects in general. It is a singular fact also, and worthy of notice, that all those who have hitherto claimed to give mankind new revelations, to be added to or else to supersede the Bible, have done so under the plea that they received this "Baptism of the Spirit," and under its influence attained their alleged knowledge. The student can readily verify this statement. Persons to-day

exist who aspire to prophecy, etc., because, as they claim, they were "baptized by the Spirit." Fanaticism repeats itself, and attracts its simple followers.

Obs. 5. The Kingship and priesthood of the saints who inherit the Kingdom, *implies* such a reception of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. The glorification that they experience; the promises given to them; the exalted position that they occupy; the work that they will perform; the intimate association with, and likeness unto, Christ—all this *involves* a baptism of the Spirit, by which they realize such a measure as will *perfectly qualify* them for their rulership. Indeed, if we take a comprehensive view of this baptism or the day of Pentecost, and consider how it relates to the Divine Plan, it will be found that, aside from the ordinary reasons assigned for its occurrence, it was given to fill out the *signs* or *evidences* of what is to be seen and experienced when the prophecies are verified in the Coming of the King and the establishment of the Kingdom. The supernatural, as we have shown (Props. 6, 7, 120, etc.), is *absolutely necessary* to accomplish this work, and while it was manifested previously, as e.g. in the miracles of Christ, yet its distinctive association *with* the Spirit and *with* the company of believers, as predicted, was not before brought out with prominence. This premonitory sign or evidence is thus, if we will but receive it, presented. It indicates how the pious wish of Moses (Num. 11 : 29) may be realized, "*would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them.*" It becomes thus not only *a proof* that Christ's sacrifice has been accepted, that His exaltation and intercessorship is prevailing, that the apostle's mission and authority is attested, that certain qualifications are bestowed, but it also becomes *evidence* of the ample fulfilment of prophecy on the scale, the very extent announced. Indeed, when we regard the promises of Christ given in this direction to believers, it is impossible *to confine* them to the present dispensation, seeing that they have not yet been fully realized. Thus e.g. the promise is to *everyone* that believeth (John 14 : 12, 13), "*the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do,*" which in its amplitude undoubtedly extends to the period of this still future predicted outpouring of the Spirit, by which we know, from the evidence already presented in a limited extent, that it is not only possible to be, but that it will be, actually fulfilled. To be made equal unto angels, to possess the power attributed unto saints, etc., in the very nature of the case, requires the conferring of the Spirit through whom *alone* those great wonders are performed. When the body of Christ, the elect Church, is completed, then the Oneness, now existing by faith and grace through the Spirit, will be *perfected* by this superior baptism, in the bodies being made like unto Christ's, and in the souls possessing divine power, and in their union with Christ as associated rulers and priests performing similar offices and acts. This opens up before us *the most astonishing and enrapturing* views of the honor, power, and glory of the saints; explaining *the source* from whence derived; showing *how* it can be verified, and teaching us that these promises are *not* exaggerated but *sober, joyful realities.* The whole is connected *with* the Coming of the King and of the Kingdom; to this period belong the promised Kingship, priesthood, equality with angels, extended wisdom and knowledge, power to work signs and wonders, unbounded influence with the Father, through Christ, ability to perform all things requisite to rulership, etc. Such is *the lofty and unspeakably great*

destiny offered to the heir of the Kingdom through the Spirit. When this baptism is realized, then indeed may the heir say with Micah, only in a more extended sense, because verified in his beautiful glorified body and in his greatly endowed spirit : "*But truly I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord and of judgment, and of might.*" It is Christ, who will thus baptize His brethren, the Spirit being His co-operator and the executor of His will. Christ has the Spirit without measure, and it is simply to be faithless to doubt *His ability* to produce through the Spirit, thus working in harmony with His will, *all the glorious things* predicted by this same Spirit.

Many persons take the predictions relating to this future outpouring of the Spirit, and dislocate them *from their connection* with the presence and reign of Jesus Christ. What Joachim (Mosheim's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 312), did—the Spirituals adopting the same—advocating "the age of the Holy Spirit" without the personal Advent, etc., of Jesus, multitudes are doing to-day. A friend of mine, who may represent an existing class, holds, that in the coming age, the Holy Spirit is to reign, thus reviving Joachim's theory, and misapprehending the Theocratic Kingdom and King. Nägelsbach (Lange's *Com.*, Isa. 32 : 15), remarks in reference to the pouring out of the Spirit : "The expression is very strong, meaning properly ; the Spirit from on high will be *emptied out* on us, *completely poured out*," which he says is indicative "of nature and of persons as wholly pervaded by Spirit." The fact is, that so wonderful is it in its work and extent that its wonder-working power is linked with the incoming dispensation in which nature, believers, and the nations enjoy its blessing. If we are to take the earnest as given on Pentecost as an indication of this outpouring, then it will come suddenly, with a rushing sound, etc. We cannot tell ; time and happy experience must impart the information. But this we do know, that varied gifts of the Spirit will then be imparted, such as speaking with tongues and interpretation, prophecy, wisdom and knowledge, teaching, discerning spirits, miracles, judgment, etc.

Obs. 6. Hence it is not correct to distinguish this dispensation as one of the Spirit exclusively, or even as pre-eminent over all that shall be given. The very same Spirit manifested His renewing, sanctifying, and even inspiring and miraculous power under the Antediluvian, Patriarchal, and Mosaic dispensations, and now in the Christian He has done this in a still more striking manner. But *to limit* His work to these, is *to ignore* a multitude of blessed predictions, which declare that "the day," or "the age," or "the world to come," is to be emphatically *the great dispensation in which the Spirit will, in the most extraordinary manner, exhibit his power*, so that what has preceded is a mere *earnest* of that which shall follow. His supernatural power will be felt in recreation, in delivering a groaning creation, in raising and quickening the bodies of believers, in qualifying them for their position of kinghood and priesthood, in bestowing Pentecostal gifts, etc. ; and hence, seeing that *the perfection and completeness* of His work is only to be witnessed in the coming age, we must attribute the most remarkable outpouring of the Spirit to that future period, thus making it *pre-eminently* a dispensation of the Spirit.

It will not answer, as some do, to limit "the Ministration of the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3 : 8), to the present dispensation, for the apostle proceeding to assign the reasons for his "hope" distinctly teaches how much of this glorious ministration relates to the future, as e.g. in its connection with the resurrection, the removal of the Jewish veil, the glorification of saints, etc. Many able writers in the past have advocated the Spirit's work in the coming dispensation, so that we only reproduce in a more logical and scriptural form the views of Millenarians. Even Joachim (and others), contended for an astonishing outpouring of the Spirit to be witnessed in the future age, but he fell into the error of making this dispensation that of the Son, and the future one that of the Holy Ghost —reversing the order laid down in the Word, that this dispensation is the one in which

the Comforter specially leads and instructs, leading to Christ, and that the age to come is, by way of pre-eminence (agreeably to covenant promise), called "the day (or period) of the Lord Jesus Christ"—and that in this day of Christ, when Jesus appears as the Theocratic King, the Holy Ghost also is manifested in extraordinary power in and through Him who has the Spirit without measure (comp. John 3 : 24 ; 2 Cor. 3 : 17, 18, etc.). We have shown under Prop. 120, etc., that our opponents concede that the Millennial age cannot be introduced as predicted without *a special* Divine interference and exertion of power. We give another illustration : Ralston (*Apoc.*, p. 163), while largely addicted to spiritualizing yet, admits that "supernatural gifts in a pre-eminent degree must be requisite." On the other hand, Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, ch. 6), labors to prove that the work of the Spirit for saving purposes will cease at the Sec. Advent, and we desire the reader—over against the abundant Scripture against it—to ponder *the extraordinary* Scripture proof adduced, viz., John 7 : 38, 39, and 14 : 26, and 17 : 26, and 15 : 36, and 16 : 7, 14 ; Acts 2 : 33 ; Tit. 3 : 5, 6 ; Rev. 3 : 1, and 5 : 6. As we meet this fully under another Proposition, it is sufficient to say, that this promised baptism of the Spirit alone sets aside this objection urged by Brown, Berg, and others (viz., that the Spirit's work ceases at the Sec. Advent), seeing that it stands closely and inseparably connected with the outpouring on the Jewish and Gentile nations. They give no direct proof but only inferential ; we, however, present direct testimony to the contrary, as e.g., Joel 2 : 28, 32 ; Acts 3 : 19-21 ; Ezek. 36 : 26, 27, and 37 : 14, and 11 : 19, etc.

There is only one passage which at first sight might be deemed to conflict with our view of a future bestowment of miraculous power, viz., 1 Cor. 13 : 8, 13, which is supposed to teach the entire cessation of prophecy and tongues. But this involves an interpretation at once antagonistic to the analogy of Scripture respecting the future ; and hence this passage must be interpreted in accordance with *the general teaching* on the subject. The Apostle in Corinthians must be understood in a comparative manner, viz., as eulogizing the supremacy of love, its superiority (including also faith and hope—which in another place he also represents as ceasing comparatively only) over the manifestations, imperfectly displayed, of the present time. The key is found in the verses 9 and 10, which indicate that the present "in part" shall give place to "the perfect," indicating the higher plane, the perfected state under this baptism. Otherwise we must, if consistent, affirm that knowledge itself shall cease, which no one believes.

Obs. 7. This inculcates *the avoidance* of those extravagant appropriations of this phraseology, and applying it to the individual experience of every believer. If we were to credit the professions of multitudes at the present day, *then* they also have experienced this "baptism of the Holy Ghost." But the credentials belonging to it are lacking, viz., that of *having received supernatural power*. In many instances, this self-appropriation arises from confounding the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit given under this phrase for the ordinary ; and those who thus profess it, do not mean the conference of unusual or extraordinary gifts and powers ; but in other cases, it is done with the annexed idea of being thus specially favored with gifts above their fellows. It is really sad to observe in looking over the past that, notwithstanding the distinctive description of this baptism and what it confers, it has been *claimed* by a great company, and it has become fruitful of misunderstanding, perversion, and extravagances. It is to be regretted that able writers, unaware of its real import, have aided to perpetuate this error. This is true even down to the most recent, as, e.g. Reuss (*His. Chr. Theol. Apos. Age*, p. 123), says : "it is precisely for this reason that the least of those who enter the Kingdom of Christ" (i.e. the Church) "*having received the baptism of the Spirit*, is greater than John the Baptist." In another place (Prop. 39), is shown how unjust to John such a representation is, and it may well be asked, in this connection, whether it can be said of "the least" in the Church that like John he was "*filled with the Holy Ghost*" (Luke 1 : 15). Reuss himself calls John "a prophet," thus indicative of his having had the Spirit in *an extraordinary*

degree, which of itself is sufficient to set aside his *extravagant* eulogy of weak Church members.

Alas! what vagaries have passed under this misunderstood phrase! Multitudes under its professed reception have claimed special honor. Only this week a large ecclesiastical body in session discussed this matter one-sidedly, and nearly every speaker urged in eloquent terms the importance of a *renewed "Baptism of the Holy Ghost"* to be experienced individually. With such the opinion does no great injury, because under the phrase they understand simply the ordinary operations, but it has often been used by fanaticism in a way to dishonor the truth—men claiming under it special power to perform great works, etc. It has ushered in many extravagances, such as e.g. in the Cathari, who (Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 454) only allowed those to be of the "perfecti," who received it, denying eternal life without it. (With them it was obtained by laying the Gospel and the hands of the elder upon the head; it was commonly delayed until near death, etc.) The student finds the same in "The Sect of the Holy Ghost," in the Fratricelli (illustrated forcibly in the case of Tauchelm; see Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 458), the Anabaptists, Jumping Sect, Calling Voices, etc., etc. Ten thousand fanciful and exorbitant claims in more modern times are to be traced to this professed baptism. For illustrations, see notes to previous Observations.

Obs. 8. This may throw light upon the disputed point, when authentic miracles ceased, or when this special baptism of the Spirit no longer transpired. The Roman Church, and various sects, parties, and individuals, even down to the present day, not only claim the perpetuation and possession of supernatural power given by the Spirit, but insist upon it, that it is *an essential* characteristic of the true Church. Others claim that it ceased to be experienced not long after the apostolic age, and that the accounts transmitted long afterward are to be received as fabulous. Unbelievers not only judge all the earlier by the later, but ask when and why miracles should have ceased and the later ones should not be credited. The usual reasons assigned for their cessation are these: that they were discontinued because the design originally contemplated of qualifying the early ministers, attesting to their mission and the truth, was duly accomplished, and that afterward they were not needed; or, that they were taken away on account of grieving the Spirit by the abuse, perversion, or denial of those gifts, or by the falling away from the faith of the Church, etc. But we hold to a better reason, viz., that if continued on, perpetuated on in the Church without intermission, the Baptism of the Spirit would have *failed in its significance as a sign, a pledge* of the future fulfilment. It was eminently suitable at the beginning of this dispensation, as illustrative of Christ's power and will to manifest this baptism as predicted by the prophets, to give to a limited extent *an evidence* of its exhibition. This is *a sign* that the prophets will be fulfilled in this very particular; but had the sign been perpetuated (as many claim it ought to have been, and was), then it would have *defeated itself* in causing the mistake (which was made, and is now so tenaciously held by the multitude), that all that the prophets predicted related to the present dispensation, and that we need not look for any better here on earth. Besides this, its continuance was unsuitable *both* to the predictions of the prophets and to the times that ensued. Fully admitting the ordinary operations of the Spirit, and that, as in previous dispensations, the Spirit is *not limited*, but can and does, even in *an extraordinary manner*, in certain cases respond to faith in the believer and work in Providence, yet this is no equivalent to this Baptism of the Spirit, which affects believers and communities of them continuously and conspicuously as evidenced in the apostles and others.[1] Now the prophecies associate this

peculiar outpouring of the Spirit *with* the Jewish nation—it is not isolated from it, but inseparably joined with its restoration, and the period of the restored Theocracy. While it was suitable to exhibit even *the signs or pledges* of future fulfilment when the temple, city, land, and people were prospered, *the propriety ceased after the destruction of the temple and city, and the captivity of the land and the people.* The consideration due to the prophets inspired by the Spirit itself (who locate the period), the respect due to Jerusalem, etc., which the Spirit itself expresses in the Word (owing to its relationship to David's Son and God Himself), now prevents the repetition of those signs *so long* as Jerusalem is trodden down by the Gentiles. A perfect realization of this baptism as described by the prophets is an utter impossibility *so long* as the Jewish nation remains unrestored, because it is linked with the period of restoration ; and to have continued the prelude to, or earnest of, better things, would have not only contradicted the prophets, but would have made a kind of imperfect fulfilment take the place of the true and perfect one. As it is, this dispensation, so exceedingly precious especially to us Gentiles, has been by many, exalted *out of all proportion* in comparison with others ; and if this baptism had continued, then under its influence, *an antagonism* between prediction and fact would have at once existed, and this dispensation would have been greatly magnified to the exclusion of any such gifts being connected with the Jewish race—with the loss of them, Gentiles have become so "*high-minded*" that anything distinctively "Jewish" is obnoxious—with the retention of them they really would possess an argument against our being "too Jewish," for then they could triumphantly point to the very prophecies pertaining to the Jews and claim that they too realized them without having arrived at the period designated. This baptism then ceased from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, both that it might be *a sign* during the prevalence of "the times of the Gentiles," and that the Spirit might preserve *the integrity and consistency* of His own glorious and truthful predictions.[2]

[1] Bushnell (*Nature and Supernatural*, ch 14) claims that the miraculous is continued down to the present, but by this he means that the supernatural is exerted in behalf of man, that God's special Providence is exhibited in behalf of faith and prayer, and that these things pertaining to the individual are matters of personal experience. This of course, all believers will allow ; but this is something widely different from the miraculous wrought by man through professed divine power. *God* is able to-day to aid supernaturally, but for any man to claim that God has *given him* the power to work miracles, that, like the Apostles, he can work wonders, etc., is simply pretending to a "Baptism of the Holy Ghost" which he has not received. We wish distinctly to be understood as not narrowing down faith or the prayer of faith, so that it cannot rely *in any emergency* upon the interference, if needed, of the Supernatural. After the recorded religious experiences given in Scripture, after the testimony of believers in behalf of faithful, persevering prayer ; after the encouragements and promises given to prayer ; after the practical realization by the writer himself of the fulfilments of God's directions in this matter, we dare not limit its prevailing power—but all this falls in with the ever prevailing (in all dispensations) ordinary Providence, working mediately or immediately, directly or indirectly, wholly *under God's own direction.* The other is *special and extraordinary,* being the conference of particular and abiding power upon man, to be exercised as his will or circumstances determine. The Supernatural always exists and is constantly available, dependent upon the Divine Will ; the conference of miraculous power, of supernatural gifts, upon the individual, as once experienced as a "sign" or "earnest" of future possession, is postponed until that period, when men, elevated by redemption to a higher plane, will employ it nobly and grandly to exalt the Divine Purpose in Theocratic rule. Hence the Supernatural in answers to prayer, marvellous escapes from danger, special deliverances, divine guidance, etc., has always manifested itself, and is an element in

religious experience which we are encouraged to invoke and expect, for God can, and does, interfere in behalf of any creature at the request and perseverance of faith, but this is very different from a miraculous power lodged in an individual. The former belong—as regeneration and sanctification—to the ordinary Supernatural bestowments promised to faith; while the latter are special exhibits of an extraordinary nature, enabling the person thus endowed to perform, in virtue of supernatural power existing with him, the miraculous. Even while the latter was evidenced in the days of Jesus and the Apostles, the former was not stayed or superseded, but when the one was withdrawn the other remained in full force. The one is given to aid the individual spiritually or temporarily, the other as a special honor and medium, and the supernatural is the foundation of both.

[2] This serves to explain the untenable and mistaken position of Ed. Irving and his followers. It is to the credit of that truly pious and noble man that he was too honest to possess what, in the nature of the case, he had no reason to expect. It is sad, however, that his line of argument materially aided others into a fatal error. In this he was eminently sincere. He was correct in not limiting the power of the Spirit, which works according to His will in heaven or in earth, but wrong in believing that that Spirit must repeat the *signs already sufficiently given before the time expressly designated*, viz., at the appearing and Kingdom, or at the restoration of the Jewish nation. Correct even in his belief that the Spirit must, according to the prophecies, manifest itself by such a baptism, for what preceded was inadequate to meet the universality, etc., indicated, he mistook—and a grevious mistake it was—by antedating the time when this should take place. Irving's history as given by Mrs. Oliphant is one of the saddest on record. But it was not only Irving but many others (as e.g. Grotius, Lavater, Hess, Lange, etc.; see *Com.* Mark 16 : 14–18, doc. 6) who held this notion of a continual perpetuation of miracles based chiefly on Mark 16 : 17, 18, overlooking the fact that the two oldest Greek MSS. (Sin. and Vat.) and other authorities omit these verses, or, if to be retained, forgetting that the extent of such signs as to time must be graduated by *the analogy* of the Scriptures on the subject. The "Baptism of the Holy Ghost" is an essential factor in the system of faith of the "Believers," who after separating from other churches to form a new one, have, it is alleged (*Six Letters or Church Questions*, p. 27), in their "Assembly" the "gifts of the ministry, in terms of Eph. 4 : 8–13; Rom. 12 : 6–8; 1. Cor. 12 : 28." That is, through *the professed* direction of the Spirit each one becomes duly impressed and qualified for the station or position he is to occupy. The door that this opens to pretension, spiritual pride, imposition, etc., is not very inviting. But this is of the same tenor with the affirmation (28, and given by one of these Spirit impressed instructors), which makes baptism something entirely *outside* of the Church, as follows: "Since, however, baptism is nowhere in the Word made a thing to be done in, or by, the assembly or its authority, but is always a matter between the evangelist and his converts, and since no divine precept marks out the mode or time of baptism, so the when, the where, and the how belong not to the assembly's responsibilities, but to those of the individuals before God." (Thus by ignoring the common-sense implication of Scripture, the universal usage of the Apostolic Church, the initiatory and confessional idea, we might make sad work of various things pertaining to the Church.) The fact is that such claimants of *special* spiritual influence and power, evidence by their divergence from the Scriptures and the common usage of the Apostolic Church, that they are not thus specially enlightened and inspired—for the Spirit does not contradict Himself—but that they take their own mental deductions and imaginings for such as are divinely derived and authorized. Such, too, more or less influenced by their supposed elevation to a plane higher than that enjoyed by others are exceedingly exacting and bigoted, as the history of the past and present attests in various professed churches, parties, and individuals—salvation out of their own standpoint being impossible, or, at least, a matter of the utmost difficulty.

In reference to the later Patristic miracles our line of argument cannot receive them as legitimate, and discards them as not only unnecessary but weakening the design intended by miraculous interference, because their frequency, puerility, etc., destroy the influence and earnest designed. An uninterrupted continuation of miracles would really have vitiated their intended use as indicated. Hence, with many others who have studied the subject, we cannot extend the Primitive miraculous period, the time of authentic miracles, beyond the Apostles and their immediate successors, for if we go farther down to the close of the second or third centuries as Newton and others suggest, or to the days of Constantine, as Oxford divines contended for, then as Locke, and recently Lecky, have reasoned, we do find, so far as mere human testimony is concerned, no place for a stop-page, seeing that the same continuous flow of evidence is found after these respective

periods forming an unbroken current. Arnold (Stanley's *Life of*, vol. 2, p. 18) remarks: "None but the Apostles ever conferred these gifts, and that therefore they ceased of course after one generation." Arnold's position is strongly confirmed by Philip's (Acts 8 : 14–17) experience, who with all his ability, evangelistic position, etc., could not make others partakers of it, showing that the power of transmission pertained *only to the apostles*, a favored few. Middleton (*Free Inquiry*) discards the later Eccles. miracles on the ground that they were "contrived or authorized at least by the leading men of the Church for the sake of governing with more ease the unruly spirit of the populace," and refers to more modern "impostures" that were thus invented and would receive countenance and support if the former were sustained. So others, as Bh. Douglas (*Criterion*), reject them as "the inventions of bold and interested deceivers." We need not be so sweeping in our denunciations, for, we doubt not, that many were the result of vivid, morbid, sincere imaginings; others proceeded from the occurrence of extraordinary events, or remarkable coincidences, or astonishing providences, to which, for the purpose of adding to the sanctity of the person or occasion, sundry embellishments were added. While some are purely apocryphal, and others have a slight foundation in the things stated, it is not requisite to question in a summary and wholesale manner the honesty or sincerity of the parties concerned. Denunciation is not the assignment of reason for the rejection of this vast claimant of miraculous power. If it be asked what shall we then do with this mass of miraculous history (which is defended by those of a highly mystical tendency, and by such as are under a Romanizing influence), the reply is something like the following: (1) The stream from the Apostles' time to the third century is very feeble as admitted by many writers (so e.g. Middleton aimed his attack chiefly at the Fathers of the fourth century) and the little knowledge that we have (aside from the New Test.) of miracles during that period is principally due to later writers. But admit, which is true, that Justin Martyr and others following him speak of miracles still continuing, (a) it only indicates what has been witnessed in every age, that great and good men (as in witchcraft, etc.) can be led to indorse from hearsay, or a love of the marvellous, or superstition, what may not be strictly correct; (b) it proves how wise the Apostles were in foreseeing such abuse and in urging care upon this very point so that no one might be deluded after their departure; (c) the integrity and honesty of such narrators is not vitiated in other respects (as little as we would condemn Sir Matthew Hale, Sir Thom. Browne, Cotton Mather, Baxter, etc., for believing in and condemning witches) seeing that they do not give them as having been performed, experienced, or even witnessed by themselves; (d) the paucity of miracles in the first two centuries after the death of the Apostles (when such a death, if the miracles were really given for the purposes so many contend for, reasonably ought to have strikingly augmented them to encourage the Church) is evidence that, with all that extraordinary love for the Supernatural then existing and so prevalent, there must have been a gradual cessation of miracles after the decease of the Apostles. Mistaken belief in the essential, and misdirected zeal, afterward eagerly accepted of the continuation as a requisite continued evidence of the divine, and correspondingly adorned and eulogized it. (2) As to the Fathers after the third century, we have no special desire to defend them even from Middleton's, in some respects, unjust attack. No doubt some were imposed upon; others gladly accepted of a general belief to aid as they supposed the truth, and with credulity received all, or nearly all, stories of the miraculous without examination; and others we fear, as Middleton charges them, manufactured them to suit the times or to exalt some saint. (3) The fulfilment of prophecy—as e.g. the prevention of Julian to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem in order to invalidate the prophecy of Jesus—is not to be rejected, for the Supernatural element is evidenced by the exactness of fulfilment whether, as in the illustration adduced, the result of foreknown natural causes or of direct intervention—for neither the sneers of Gibbon nor the credulity of writers on the subject vitiate the miraculous knowledge exhibited by our Saviour. (4) The Roman Catholic Church lays special claim to a continuous power of working miracles from the days of the Apostles down to the present (even asserted by Dr. Milner in *Lett.* 26, p. 163, etc.). Bellarmine (*Opera*, vol. 2, etc.) endeavors to frame an argument from this in favor of the Romish Church and against Protestants, viz., that miracles being found lacking in the Protestant Church, the true Church is only found in his own communion. So profusely too are they given that those attributed e.g. to Ignatius Loyola (Nicolini's *His. of the Jesuits*, p. 262) are more numerous than those ascribed to Moses or an Apostle. The Mormons and others hold that this power of working miracles was intended to be continuous but was lost, and now, as evidence of divine power and of being the true Church, is again restored in their respective communions. But unfortunately for all such claims, the miracles will not stand the test

of criticism ; many of them by their evident absurdity, puerility, lack of design, confirmatory of error, etc., containing their own condemnation. Writers like Cummings, Horne, Bh. Newton, Jenkin, Campbell, Lardner, Leland, Conybeare, Taylor, Farmer, Adams, and others, having fully exposed their pretensions and shown that the original fountain is not the source of such a stream. (5) These miraculous manifestations were originally given as "*signs*," and not merely as "divine credentials" to accredit an inspired messenger or the truth, for they indicate that the truth to which they are linked and which constantly looks forward to the "restitution" as the ultimate outcome, evidences by these tokens that the Supernatural really exists to insure a fulfilment. Communicating truths which demand Supernatural power for their realization it is the most reasonable and just to have some demonstration, some sign, to show that the Supernatural is not lacking. If such "*signs*," were not given unbelievers would be the very first to demand them. But the constant repetition of such "signs" would weaken if not defeat, their significancy. Habitual and commonplace, they would altogether lose their *representative* character. To sustain even this position consistently and honorably it must be shown that the truths they attest, the doctrines they authenticate, the Divine Plan they substantiate, are worthy of the Supernatural.

In Buckle's *Mis. Works*, vol. 2, art. 447, is this reference : "I perceive in the language of the Fathers who lived in the middle and end of the second century, when speaking on this subject something which betrays if not a conviction at least a suspicion, that the power of working miracles *was withdrawn*, combined with an anxiety to keep up a belief of its continuance in the Church" (*The Eccl. His.* of the Sec. and Third Centuries, illustrated from the writings of Tertullian, 8vo. 1845, 3d ed., pp. 93–95. See also p. 133 of the Bh. of Lincoln's *Works*). The Bh. of Lincoln (*Eccl. His.*, p. 92) and Beaven (*Life of Irenæus*, p. 70) are of the opinion that miracles ceased after the apostolic age. Papias and Irenæus so closely related to this age, speak of the raising of the dead. But the Fathers down to the fourth century (as Bh. Douglas remarked) relate no miracles, and the Fathers after the fourth century, when they—aside from oratorical and panegyrical writings—theologically discuss the question of miracles, admit the cessation of such evidence, e.g. Augustine (*De Utilitate Credendi*, and *De Vera Religione*), Chrysostom (*Ser.* 33 and 36, and in *Epistolam* 1, *ai Corinth, Homil.* 6. 2, and *Hom.* 29), with which compare Fr. Nitzsch's *Augustinus' Lehre vom Wunder*, and the admissions of Prof. Newman in *Two Essays on Scripture Miracles and on Ecclesiastical* (2d ed.), Dr. Schaff's statements (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 206, etc.), Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*, Killen's *Ancient Church*, p. 278, Prof. Worman's art, "Miracles Ecclesiastical" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Olshausen's *Com.*, vol. 3, p. 683, Knapp's *Theol.*, p. 255, etc. Dr. Neander, Bh. Kaye, and many others incline to a gradual cessation theory, and base it on the ground (different from the one advanced by us) that miracles were gradually withdrawn as the necessity of such outward attestation was removed by the firm establishment of the Church. Much that is written to account for this cessation we cannot receive. To illustrate : Dr. Tyng in *He Will Come*, p. 169, says that miracles ceased suddenly on account of unbelief—"the sin of unbelief is the thief" that caused "the sudden cessation of extraordinary gifts and powers in the Church." This makes their appearance contingent on faith and materially aids the claims of those who profess to have such faith (as e.g. "Catholic Apostolic Church ;" see art. on in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, the "Believers," "Mormons," etc.). The fact is that the Baptism of the Spirit was conferred when the number of believers was but small, and they had no conception of its gifts or extent. Troutman (*The Apost. Church*, p. 309, quoted by Schaff) remarks : it "could not and must not continue in the Church. It could not because the earthly human nature is not able constantly to bear the bliss of ecstacy and such mighty streams of power from above, as is shown by the example of the three chosen disciples on the Mt. of Transfiguration. It must not be—because the continuance of the blossom would have hindered the development of the fruit. The splendor of these higher powers would unavoidably have fixed the eye and the heart too much on externals, and the proper object and work of faith, the inward conquest of the world would have been neglected." This is simply manufacturing reasons to account for the cessation, and which overlook (1) that the same power which imparted the gifts could also—and did—bestow the ability to endure the reception ; and (2) that the union of blossom and fruit, of eye and heart, of the object and work of faith, of external and internal, is abundantly evidenced in the purity, faithfulness, activity, etc., of its first recipients. Dr. Schaff (*His. Apos. Ch.*, p. 471) advocates the cessation of "the temporary form" but the retention of "the essence," by which he probably means that the Supernatural which is the basis of miraculous manifestations is still retained, and evidences its retention e.g. in regeneration, sanctification, Providence,

answers to prayer, etc. We have no objection to the idea but to the manner in which it is introduced, failing to do justice and give significancy to "the earnest." It may be asserted that the Bible does not expressly declare the revocation of Supernatural gifts. But the reason for this is apparent; the First and Second Advents, owing to their instrumentality in Redemption, etc., are co-joined (Prop. 34), this dispensation being intercallary, and nothing is expressed to indicate its long continuance for the reasons previously given (which such a temporary revocation would imply); hence the gifts are linked with the Advents as expressive of the Supernatural. A revocation also might be easily misapprehended and misapplied as e.g. causing doubt respecting their future conference; or exciting unbelief in God's accessibility and willingness to bless and deliver in His ordinary Providence; or weaken faith in the divine attributes and Will, by representing God as bound not to exert special Supernatural power if emergencies demanded the same. We add in conclusion that this temporary suspension may give us a clew to the cessation of demoniacal possessions in the form attributed to them in the Gospels. For as Ebrard (*Gospel History*, p. 31) says: "It was ordained in the counsels of God that Supernatural power should only be granted while the foundations of the Church were being laid, and that the Church should then by simply natural development proceed in her world-conquering career. And it naturally followed that God henceforth restrained these demoniacal influences also." (The student may consider; if so, may not such influences be again let loose under Antichristian control just previous to the reintroduction and exertion of these miraculous gifts, and the professed wonders and miracles of Antichrist be met by the true Supernatural power thus restored by the Baptism of the Spirit?)

Obs. 9. It also aids in our interpretation of other Scripture. Thus e.g. the sin against the Holy Ghost which cannot be forgiven (Matt. 12 : 31, 32; Mark 3 : 29; Luke 12 : 10) obtains a peculiar significancy and enormity, when it is considered that this baptism of the Spirit was regarded and so pronounced (Acts 5 : 32), as *a direct* witnessing and testifying of the Spirit, and hence to mock, deride, or falsely ascribe such signs or evidence proceeding from the Spirit, was *to vilify* the mighty Agent itself through which humanity, yea the Son of Man Himself (regarded as David's Son), was to experience the fulfilment of covenant promises and predictions. The inexcusableness of the sin arises from the conspicuous manner, powerful manifestations (above nature), and character of the Agent. And, it may well be considered whether this sin can be committed now as it was in the days when these special gifts were bestowed, by mocking at the record of them. The culpability of those who witnessed these wonders (for Jesus addressed those who were to see them, and we are told that some mocked and others derided them), is of course greater in one respect than that of others who have not seen them, and yet the record itself is so interwoven with additional evidences that the guilt of those who now ridicule them is certainly great. Again, take the promise (Matt. 6 : 33), "*Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.*" If we consider that this was said before the postponement of the Kingdom when the Kingdom was offered on the condition of repentance, we see at once how this would have been fulfilled just as given. For, if the nation had repented and the Kingdom would have been re-established then under the marvellous influence of the Spirit, just as predicted by the prophets, "all these things" would have been added, seeing that under this Spirit's influence abundance and plenty for all classes is expressly promised. Aside from the grace of God which now even in response to faith so often inchoately verifies the promise, it still points us on when the Kingdom itself shall be attained and there will be no lack, owing to the power and manifestation of the Spirit.

The student, of course, will see here a reason why the terrific vengeance of God will

fall so heavily upon Antichrist and his confederates. This sin against the Holy Spirit will be repeated on a grander scale than ever by the blasphemous declarations of unbelief, and the result announced by Jesus follows, viz., that no forgiveness will be allowed. The two passages selected for reference afford a fine contrast to the blasphemy of one party and their inevitable fate, and to the faith of another party and the blessings resulting.

Obs. 10. If the reader will turn back to Props. 126–128, and notice what is said respecting the being "*born of water and of the Spirit,*" he will see that its meaning extends (whatever application may be made of it to the present) to this very future outpouring of the Spirit. Without repeating what has already been suggested, it is sufficient to say to the student, that Christ's appeal to Nicodemus that he ought to know these things, evidently because recorded in the Scriptures, indicates that reference is made to the prophecies which predict the sprinkling with "clean water," the obtaining of "a new spirit," the putting of God's Spirit "within" them, and the raising up of the dead out of their graves by the power of the Spirit, all of which is represented *as essential* to the introduction of the Kingdom, and its blessings, and as related to the glorious reign of David's Son. The language of Christ is, therefore, far from being exhausted in the experience of believers in the present dispensation.

Obs. 11. The reader is reminded how this view at once completely removes the ungenerous objection urged against us, that we do not make out a spiritual but "*carnal*" Kingdom. When the King has this Spirit without measure; when He baptizes His associated body of rulers in a large, wonderful measure, and the subjects in a measure indicative of the variety of the Spirit's ministrations; when the Spirit exerts His Almighty energy in every direction extending even to the material creation; surely the government swayed under such imparted and revealed power, must be also *pre-eminently spiritual.* So plain is this, that it needs no additional remarks.

Obs. 12. Let us now return to the consideration of another baptism to be experienced at the same time, viz., the baptism of or with fire. The explanations usually given of this baptism are evidently incorrect. Fire being used as a figure of afflictions, trials, etc., it is supposed by some commentators to denote a baptism of such afflictions. But this is *harsh* for John was undoubtedly predicting *a blessing* and not trial. Others again make fire the emblem of judgment, wrath, or vengeance (for it is thus employed), and pronounce this a baptism of vengeance upon the enemies, while that of the Holy Ghost is one of blessing upon the friends of God. But this is arbitrarily *dividing* the promise and making part of it *a curse.* Others even make the fire to mean "the fire of hell torment" which Reuss justly calls "*a very unskilful exegesis.*" But Reuss, and others, do not mend the matter, when they make the fire only to be the symbol of the Spirit, for that introduces a harsh *redundancy*, causing the promise to read: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with the Holy Ghost." Others think that it denotes that the ministry of Christ would be refining, trying, powerful, purifying, etc., but this does *not accord* with the spirit of the prediction, which, as it is linked with the previous prophecies, indicates a special blessing added to the one conferring miraculous or supernatural gifts. To ascertain its meaning, we have only to allow scriptural usage to give us the key which enables us to interpret this promise consistently

with *the analogy* of Bible promise, thus avoiding the making it a mere emblem of the Spirit or of His presence, or of His purity and power, or of the reception by believers of affliction instead of happiness, dishonor instead of honor, pain instead of pleasure, and punishment instead of triumph. Fire is employed to denote *the power of judging*, or rather *of executing judgment* upon others. Such passages as Deut. 4 : 24 ; Heb. 12 : 29 ; Amos. 1 : 4, and 5 : 6, etc., show that such *a power* is intended. Now in reference to the saints, the chosen elect body, who shall reign with Christ, we find Rev. 19 : 14 ; Jude 14, etc. (see Prop. 154), that they are united with Christ in executing judgment, that Rev. 2 : 26–27, they shall have "power over the nations" to "rule them with a rod of iron ;" and hence it is written, Ps. 149 : 9 that "*this honor have all His saints*" "to execute the judgment written," etc. Those who are familiar with the Scriptures need scarcely be told that Rev. 14 : 18 ; Isa. 10 : 17 ; Isa. 1 : 27 ; Isa. 62 : 1, etc., relate to this time. As to the Jewish nation, such predictions as Zech. 12 : 6 ; Zech. 14 : 12–21 ; Micah 7 : 16–17, etc., give us a clew to the power that they shall possess, when (Micah 4 : 8 see Prop. 114), "the first dominion" among nations is granted unto it. At this period such a bestowment of baptism is *indispensably necessary*, owing to the plain predicted fact, that the anti-Christian power will be dominant and must, before the Theocracy is firmly re-established, be overthrown. Hence in the spirit of this promised baptism, Christ and His messengers come "*in flaming fire*" (2 Thess. 1 : 8), and these "*messengers of His power*" or "*ministers*" of His pleasure shall be so many "*flames of fire*" possessing, in virtue of this baptism, *the ability* to pour out "*the consuming fire*" that God has threatened against the ungodly, the rebellious, and the enemies of His people. Let the reader turn to Props. 115, 161, 162, 163, and he will see what a fearful time this will be, and how the saints and Jewish nation participate in it ; and here he finds *the link* in the chain which tells him *how they are qualified* for this particular agency. That we are not mistaken in this interpretation is proven by *the limited, partial* fulfilment on the day of Pentecost. The "*cloven tongues like as fire*" which "sat upon each of them" is *an emblem* of this power, it being added to the other gifts as expressive of *the promised baptism of fire* which was to be associated with that of the Holy Ghost ; it being virtually an outgrowth or adjunct to it. But owing to its enormous power, and to the danger of its being perverted even in the hands of good men, *it was purposely circumscribed or limited to a very few persons.* It was sufficient to give "*a sign*" that it was imparted, and then to exhibit the reality of its conference by *actual* performance. The power thus designated by "fire" (also indicated John 20 : 23 after the previous symbolic act stated in verse 22) the apostles *rarely* used, it being more specially intended for the coming age. Hence only in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5), of Elymus (Act 13), of the incestuous person (1 Cor. 5), and a few others, was it really exercised. We may rest assured, however, that the time is coming, when it shall be exerted on a scale that will confound the enemies of God.

Dr. Schaff (Lange's *Com. loci*) justly points out the harshness of separating the Holy Ghost and the fire as referring to opposite classes of persons as some of the Fathers and modern expositors. This harshness even Nast (*Com. loci*) perpetuates when making the "you" to represent two parties, viz., the believing who are baptized with the Spirit, and the unbelieving who are baptized with fire, i.e. with "the consuming fire of God's judgments." On the other hand Schaff pertinently points to the day of Pentecost where this baptism in both particulars was given to the same persons. The views which make this

fire the love of God, the sanctifying influences of the Spirit, the fire of hell, the fire of purgatory, the fire of tribulation, the fire of penitence and mortification, the fire of grace, a material fire, temporal and eternal punishments, "the consummation and complete triumph of the new and higher life in its peculiar nature," Christ's ministry—are all seeking after a meaning which is not warranted. The confining of this promise to the day of Pentecost is to limit its extent and to overlook the inchoate nature of the Pentecostal manifestations. The perversions are strange from Origen's notion (Hagenbach's *His. of Doc.*, vol. 1, p. 223) that all at the end of the world, not excepting even Paul or Peter, would have to experience this fire, a literal fire (connected with the last conflagration) as a test, the pure not being materially affected by it, down to the "Morelschiki" ("the Self-sacrificing;" so Kurtz, *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 222), who submit to a "baptism of fire" by actually burning themselves. In the *Life of Ed. Irving*, by Mrs. Oliphant (p. 535 and 569), we find how the phrase was misapprehended by one of "the prophets." In interpretations and applications, 1 Cor. 3 : 13 has played an important part, overlooking other usages of the Scriptures. We only add that our view of the subject gives us a proper conception of the ability and power of the rulers in this Theocratic ordering, and how all nations, all kingdoms must submit to a sovereignty so directly, impressively, and powerfully sustained by *the Supernatural*. Hence we must discard much that is professed sincerely but unwarrantedly at the present time, as e.g. Rev. Harrison (the revivalist) at the Loveland Camp-meeting, as reported (e.g. the *Times-Star*, Aug. 3d, 1881), stated in his religious experience that he had received "the baptism of fire." We may say, for the reasons already given, that we very much doubt it.

PROPOSITION 172.—*This Kingdom when restored does not require the reintroduction of bloody sacrifice.*

The Theocratic arrangement binds together into one the Church and State, manifesting in wonderful condescension God ruling as earthly Ruler in and through David's Son. This by no means demands the restoration of Mosaic sacrifices, seeing that the King, in virtue of His sinlessness, perfection, etc., made *one sacrifice* which is *amply sufficient* to cover all redemptive purposes in the past, present and future. Heb. 7 : 22-27. The perfection and completeness of the sacrifice is insisted upon, as e.g. Heb, 10 : 1–18. There is nothing, therefore, in the Kingdom itself, i.e. in a Theocratic rule, which should cause us either directly or by implication, to advocate a return to sacrifices, which "*could not make perfect*" (Heb. 9 : 9), which were "*a shadow of good things to come*" (Heb. 10 : 1), and which would seem by their restoration to lessen the value and perfection of Christ's offering of Himself. Indeed, if, as our argument indicates, this Kingdom, by virtue of Christ's work and the efficacy of His blood in sealing and fulfilling the covenant, is a bringing the world back into its Edenic state as it would have existed without the introduction and results of human depravity, then such a restored state, *to exhibit justice* to the merits which brings in its restoration, should be one *in which bloody sacrifices do not exist.*

The reader will observe that in the ages to come one distinctive peculiarity is the deliverance of the creature from its bondage (Prop. 146). If the animals are not to destroy each other, much less will they be slain for sacrificial purposes, for such a destiny would indicate the reverse of Millennial promises. We leave this thought, affording an inferential reason for more direct statements. To the student we remark that it is remarkable that even some Jewish authorities take the view of a cessation of sacrifice. Thus Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 2, p. 260) quotes from Schoettgen (*Hor. Heb.* et Tal. 2, p. 612) some as follows : "In the times of the Messiah all sacrifices will cease, but the sacrifice of praise will not cease." "When the Israelites were in the holy land, they took away all diseases and punishments from the world, through the acts of worship and the sacrifices which they performed ; but now Messiah takes these away from the sons of men." "That He (the Messiah) would pour out His soul unto death and that His blood would make atonement for the people of God." (The last is quoted by Bähr from Eisenheimer's *Entdectes Judenthum*, vol. 2, p. 720.) But as Fairbairn justly observes, these isolated expressions of individual opinion are opposed by the multitude of directly opposite ones.

Obs. 1. Attention is called to the question of sacrifices in this form, seeing that Dr. Brown (*The Sec. Coming*, etc.), Dr. Hodge (*Sys. Div.*), Dr. Rice (*Signs of the Times*), etc., make the advocacy of a return to sacrifices (as is done by some Millenarians, e.g. D. N. Lord, Tyso, Shimeall, Begg, etc.), *a serious objection* to the reception of our doctrine. They allege that

such a restoration would be a return to "bondage," "beggarly elements," etc., and that it invalidates the sufficiency of Christ's offering. We are free to admit, that if our system *necessarily* involves such a restoration of sacrifice it would indeed form a grave objection against our view in the light of Galatians and Hebrews. The argumentation of its advocates that such sacrifices are merely "commemorative," "retrospective," etc., do not help the matter very much, so that while the objection is not sufficiently strong in itself to set aside all the other truths pertaining to this subject, yet it is ample enough to cause hesitation and doubt in the minds of many. Fully agreeing with the idea that if such a return is clearly taught, it should not hinder us from accepting it, even if we cannot reconcile its readoption; fully persuaded also, that if taught, it would not be essential to our doctrine being connected with the revelations and arrangements of "the world to come;" yet the question naturally arises *whether* such a restoration of sacrifices *is really taught.* After carefully regarding the prophecies and weighing the reasoning assigned in its behalf, we are forced to the conclusion, that it is nowhere taught in the Bible; that, therefore, no such apparent "contradiction," as our opponents allege, can be *legitimately* forced upon our system; and that as some of our friends have supposed, the sacrifices are not necessary to "illustrate the great work of Redemption," and to bring out more "significantly" faith in Christ's offering. The reasons for taking such a position follow.

Fry (*Sec. Advent*), Freemantle (*Lent Lect. for* 1847), Thomas (*The Kingdom of God*), Bonar (*Lent Lect. for* 1847), and others hold to this reintroduction, and speak of it as "retrospective," "visible exposition of His sin-bearing work," etc. In Bohn's ed. of the *Eccles. His. of Philostorgius*, p. 490, b. 8, in a footnote, reference is made to Apollinaris and Basil, as if they taught that after the resurrection there would be a return to Jewish rites and ceremonies for a thousand years. On the other hand, such men as Increase Mather (*The Mysteries of Israel's Salvation*), a Pre-Millenarian, opposed the reintroduction of bloody sacrifices, and insisted that the Primitive Church (Pre-Mill.) objected to it, and represented that the Jews, after their conversion, would be, not under the Mosaic, but under a new ordering. So also Perry (*Glory of Christ's Visible Kingdom*), the Duke of Manchester (*The Finished Mystery*), and others. Comp. also Baumgarten (Herzog's *Real Encyclop.*, 4, p. 298, etc.), Auberlen (*Daniel and the Rev.*, p. 384).

Obs. 2. It is universally agreed that the main, leading argument in favor of a return to sacrifices is found in the last chapters of Ezekiel. If this portion of Scripture can be *reasonably explained* so as to satisfactorily remove the notion of such a return, the difficulty itself disappears. How are we to understand Ezekiel? The theories given are the following: 1. That the whole is to be spiritualized, i.e. another sense than that conveyed by the language is to be given to it. This leaves it at *the mere fancy* of the interpreter, and results in various inconsistencies. The latest effort in this direction by Cowles, is a sufficient commentary. 2. That it relates exclusively to the future, and that all will be fulfilled as written. But *against this* we have (a) the utterances of Paul in Galatians and Hebrews, (b) contradictions evolved, as e.g. respecting the Prince, which render it untenable. 3. That it pertains to the future, and that sacrifices with some other particulars are omitted in the fulfilment. But this is *an arbitrary and dangerous* interpretation, seeing that the prophecy stands or falls as *a consistent whole.* 4. That it was mere human prediction, and the prophet was mistaken in his conjectures. No believer of the Word can accept of *so unworthy* an opinion. 5. That it relates to the future and involves an

apparent contradiction, which we cannot reconcile but will be fully cleared up in the new dispensation. This view takes it for granted that only a difficulty of comprehension, i.e., how this will be done (as in the case of Isaac), exists, while in reality there is much more connected with it, viz., *a real contradiction* with other Scriptures. 6. That like all prophecies pertaining to the Jews, it is conditional, and that the mention of sacrifices sufficiently proves its conditionality. Whatever our opinion may be concerning this particular prediction, the conditionality of it must be based *on other grounds* than those thus expressed, for (a) all prophecy is not conditional Prop. 18, and (b) the mention of anything in a prediction which may not suit our ideas of the fitness of things, is no proof without additional testimony of its being conditional.

The notion that it was partly fulfilled at the return from Babylon and partly in this dispensation, need not to be refuted in detail. The arbitrary dividing, etc., of the prophecy is a sufficient refutation. The unbelieving, symbolistic, spiritualizing views (e.g. given in detail in Lange's *Com. on Ezek.*, concluding chapters), which, without venturing on the explanation or reception of details, rush to conclusions on general principles dominating and influencing the interpreter—may be dismissed on the ground of doing injustice to the prophet and violence to the prophecy. The allegorical, typical, and mystical are simply arbitrary and depend for their one-sidedness upon the imagination or speculations of the interpreter in order to form an accommodation with Christianity as now existing, just as if the particulars of the extended prediction met with a fulfilment in the Church. The recent efforts of Fairbairn and Henderson to show that we have merely an ideal—Christian or spiritual typical representation of the good to be bestowed upon the Church in this dispensation, evidence the fact that it is *utterly impossible* for them, from their standpoint, to incorporate the numerous particularisms of the prophecy, but which we are to receive simply as embellishments, added to adorn the main, leading idea of ideal or symbolic import. It is supposed by many that it simply conveys the idea, through abounding imagery or symbolism, of the future subjection of the Israelites to the Messiah. In support of this opinion the entire prophecy is made figurative, and the figures are spiritualized to suit the Messianic views of the interpreter. Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 378, note) declares his inability (like Jerome) to explain Ezekiel as a whole, but thinks that the figurative explanation, as it applies to parts of it, will ultimately, by "a sober and patient investigation of the typical and symbolical language of the Old Test. in the light of the New," find the proper solution. Fausset (*Com. Ezek.*) applies this to a future "Theocratic temple," but does not know how far it is to be interpreted literally or figuratively, thinking that when the event occurs it will clear up all seeming difficulties. Many find it so difficult that they avoid any expression of opinion as to its meaning and application.

Obs. 3. Taking the position that this prophecy is *conditional*, we must present other reasons than those last alleged in order to keep within the limits assigned under Prop. 18. For, no prediction ought to be regarded as such, unless it contains within itself, or in the context, or future explanation, the elements *clearly indicative of conditionality*. Ezekiel's prediction unmistakably contains *the requisite evidence*, which places it clearly among the conditional prophecies. The *key* to it is found in ch. 43 : 7–11 where the re-establishment of the Theocratic rule *is conditioned by* "*now let them put away their whoredom and the carcasses of their kings, and I will dwell in the midst of them forever,*" "*if they be ashamed of all that they have done,*" etc. It is expressly asserted that this prediction is given, "*that they may be ashamed of their iniquities*" in order that what is promised may also be verified. The simple question to be asked is this : *did* the Jewish nation after the prophecy was given *repent* of its sinfulness and manifest by its shame that *it was worthy* of such a reconstruction of the government? Let the facts as given in history witness, and we are forced

to the conclusion that the reason *why* no such Theocratic restoration (compare Jer. 17 : 25 with context—same conditionally expressed) was affected, was owing simply to *the lack* of a national repentance commensurate with a bringing it into operation. The repentance and acknowledgments of individuals and of a portion of the nation, is not sufficient to bring back this richly forfeited blessing. If it be asked, *why* does God give this lengthy prediction foreknowing that it will never, in the shape given, be realized owing to continued national sinfulness and unworthiness, the answer is plain : judging from other portions of the Word, it is done in necessary accommodation to the free agency of man. Let the reader consider, that this prophet predicts this *previous* to a partial restoration of the nation to its own land. Now in connection with even such a foreknown restoration, it is eminently proper for God to offer also (*conditioned by repentance*, as at the First Advent, see Props. 57, 58, etc.), a restoration of the Theocratic government. This, as every student admits, is done here, and we may reasonably conclude, that *if the conditions* imposed by God *had been accepted* by the nation, *then* all would have been abundantly verified. Hence as the conditions were not complied with—only in a very imperfect manner and which never resulted in a widespread and continuous reformation—the prophet gives us *a sad representation of blessings that were lost*, and most fully answers the question, *what* the state of the Jewish nation *would have been* provided it had on its restoration been obedient to God. Taking this view of it, the prediction is *necessary* in filling out what otherwise would prove *a blank* in Jewish history. It teaches us *in what form the Theocracy would have been restored*, had the Jews been " ashamed," etc., thus manifesting God's willingness to bless and His love for His people and land.

The Jews no doubt will be largely influenced by Ezekiel to attempt, during their partial Pre-Millennial restoration to Palestine, to carry out this prediction in the building of a temple, a return to the Mosaic ritual in which bloody sacrifices will be again prominently brought forth. Jewish writers (according to Fairbairn) have maintained that this prediction was imperfectly realized after the captivity and under Herod, but that " it waits to be properly accomplished by the Messiah, who, when He appears, shall cause the temple to be reared precisely as here described, and carry out all the other subordinate arrangements." We should, therefore, in our interpretation of Ezekiel, be guarded lest, indirectly, we encourage through it such a restoration. Exhibiting and enforcing its past conditionality, we give them no hope of such a realization and yet preserve intact the integrity, apparent meaning, etc., of the text. Fairbairn and others denominate this Jewish view " carnal," etc., but, aside from the future application of fulfilment, the Jewish idea of its real meaning is far superior to their own figurative view, for it accords —as the identity of particular description shows—with the language and particularism of the Pentateuch. If the one can be spiritualized at the will of the interpreter, so also may the other.

Obs 4. Having thus shown the conditionality of the prediction fairly expressed within itself, we may now add, that *the entire structure* of the prophecy indicates that it by no means refers to the final fulfilment of the covenant, but is also *preparative* to such a fulfilment. Persons have been misled into the idea that it must refer to the predicted, covenanted reign of Jesus Christ, owing to *a kind of correspondence* between the Theocratic rule, the city, temple, worship, etc., and that of the future under Christ, which caused the hasty conclusion that they were *identical*, thus overlooking (1) *the points of divergence ;* (2) *the utter inaptitude* of applying some things to Christ's reign ; (3) *the inapplicability* of certain statements concerning the Prince to the person and character of Christ ; (4) *the unfitness*

of a portion to describe either the characteristics of the Mill. era, or the nature and employments of the glorified saints associated with Christ. Similarity of description in some respects—which the Theocracy, the same inheritance, throne, kingdom, etc., necessarily includes—is *no evidence of identity*. This will be seen by passing over some of the statements contained in the prophecy, which prove, that it is *not intended* to describe the reign of the promised seed, David's Son and David's Lord. This will, of course, be corroborative of its conditionality as shown under Obs. 3. Notice : 1. This Prince is *a mortal man ;* for to him are ascribed "sons" to whom he may give gifts etc. (ch. 45 : 16–18), and he is exhorted not to do wrong.' 2. This Prince being thus *mortal and unglorified*, is subject to *sinfulness*, for he is exhorted to offer "*a sin-offering*" in behalf of "*himself*" as well as for all the people, which cannot be applied to Christ, see ch. 45 : 17–22. 3. The entire tenor of the prediction in its relation to the Prince, the Priests, the Sacrificers, etc., makes a decided impression that it describes *a continuation* of the Mosaic ritual, not retrospectively or commemoratively but *prospectively* in the form instituted under Moses and retained by David (e.g. Ezek. 45 : 17–25). 4. The *priesthood* of the Prince, *is not allowed* (ch. 46 : 2), while Christ is *a Priest* forever on His throne. 5. The priests are *mortal men*, for they are subject to marriage and death (ch. 44 : 22), which is very different from *the priesthood* pertaining to the saints in the Mill. era, and who are associated with Christ in His reign. It is true, that other priests, aside from the saints, might be introduced, yet in the Mill. descriptions we find only the saints specifically denominated the priests, and if this were a Mill. prediction *then* the exalted priesthood of the saints would be entirely passed by. The spirit of the prophecy does not accord with the predictions relating to the Millennium or reign of Christ. 6. The *character* ascribed to the Princes, a strong tendency to exactions (ch. 45 : 9), does not correspond with that given to the Rulers (as e.g. apostles ruling over twelve tribes), who, immortal and ever holy, reign with Christ over Israel and the world. 7. The *extent* of the dominion, power, and glory of the Prince and of his Theocratic rule, is *too circumscribed and limited* to meet the requirements of Mill. portrayals. From such considerations as these, it is *simply impossible*, with any degree of consistency, to apply and interpret this prophecy as relating to the promised Messiah's reign. To do this, is *to violate* the intent of this Scripture, the sublime descriptions of the character and perfection of Christ, and to fasten upon our doctrine *an unnecessary, and unbelief producing*, interpretation. The Theocratic rule here delineated, is *very different* from that exhibited under Christ and His associated body of rulers ; and before we can accept of it as Messianic, i.e. descriptive of the future reign of Jesus Christ, *it must be shown*, that the reigning Prince here presented is *identical* with Christ. The only answer that might be given is this : that this Prince is a mortal, ruling over the Jewish nation at its future restoration under—subject to—the reign of Christ. But this reply only increases the difficulty, for then (1) we have a lengthy Mill. description *without Christ* being introduced ; (2) a Theocratic rule without *the real Theocratic King* being noticed ; (3) a King seated on David's throne and ruling over David's Kingdom (Christ's *special inheritance*, as David's Son), without *the covenanted King* who shall do this being mentioned ; (4) a mortal man thus exalted to rule over the twelve tribes of Israel over and above the apostles who are *specially designated* in other places ; (5) a lodgment of

Theocratic rulership in a person who is liable to sin and corruption, which *is opposed to the Plan of God* now carried on to secure a government which in its rulers is far beyond all evil influences.[2]

[1] A Jewish Rabbi (Bibas) asserted that the Messiah must be a mere man, because in Ezek. 46 : 16 "the Prince and his sons" are mentioned (*Miss. of Inq. to Jews*, p. 395). The Com. of Inquiry answered that the Messiah was not spoken of but the Prince over Israel under Him. The Rabbi replied, "Oh! then you give us two rulers." We have at least here nothing of the twelve Apostles ruling over the twelve tribes of Israel as promised to them by Jesus. And we may rest assured that *no mortal prince* will ever be exalted as a superior Ruler *over* the glorified Rulers.

[2] Many points of convergence might be adduced which fortify our position, as e.g. the enforcement of circumcision of the flesh, ch. 44 : 9, which the New Test. (e.g. Gal. 5 : 1–6) regards as something of the past, etc. The view of some (Rev. Rowe) that this is only a temporary arrangement at the beginning of the Mill. era, is open to the same objections already enumerated. The positive assertions of Thomas (*Elpis Israel*, p. 280, etc.) that Jesus will build this temple, is to be rejected, seeing that Jesus, as represented in the New Test., and as glorified, is not mentioned, the saints are not introduced, and the entire description does *not accord* with other Mill. predictions. The simple fact is that every such application introduces an antagonism irreconcilable with the future Messianic reign as portrayed by other prophets.

Obs. 5. The highly significant phraseology combined with this prophecy, such as "*the name of the city from that day shall be, the Lord is there,*" etc., has led many to suppose that this alone is applicable to the era after the Second Advent when Christ shall personally come and reign, and thus "the Lord is there," etc. As a matter of course, when *the Theocratic rule* under Jesus Christ is restored, such will be the fact, and the language applies, but it must not be overlooked that it would be *equally applicable to the Theocratic rule* under any of the seed of David, if it had been reinstated by the acceptance of the conditions imposed by God. In the very nature of the case, when God condescends to act as earthly Ruler over the nation in and through David's throne (which He has called His own), "*the Lord is there*" *in His anointed one.* Much of the language is expressive of Theocratic Rule and its results, and must be explained in its relationship to the peculiar and distinctive stage of it that is here meant. The fact, that similar language can be used in reference to Christ's reign, does not prove *identity*, but only shows, that His rule is *also Theocratic* in its nature and results. Even the city with its similarity of gates named after the twelve tribes, is only a pattern of the restored Theocratic city (Rev. 21 : 12) under Christ.

It is this similarity which has induced many to seek an identity at the expense of the prophetic language and ideas. Dr. Baumgarten (Herzog's *Encyclop.*, art. "Ezekiel") under its influence advocates a renewal of "glorified sacrificial feasts," etc. Dr. Lange in his Bremen Lectures (p. 249) ridicules this position, speaking of "slaying with glorified knives glorified oxen," but the simple truth is that Lange, Keil, Fairbairn, and a host of others who make sport of Baumgarten, Auberlen, Hofman, Volch, etc., do not mend the matter when, inconsistently to the tenor of the prophecy, they give to it, *by spiritualizing and forcing*, a Messianic turn. The one party at least endeavor to preserve the language and unity of the prediction, the other by figurative applications make it to teach the very opposite of that which its language grammatically presents. The one party mistakes as to its fulfilment; the other, with all its boasting and condemnation of others, falls into a similar mistake.

Obs. 6. The conditionality of this prophecy, by no means can be adduced as proof (so Waggoner, etc.), that the Jews *will never* be restored and the Davidic kingdom *will never* be rebuilt. If it indeed referred *to the cove-*

nanted reign of Christ, then an argument might be formed against us, on the ground of the conditional terms embraced in the prediction. But *it must first be shown* that it has such a connection. Being strictly in the line of conditional prophecies, and delineating only *a provisional, preparatory stage* (not realized owing to sin), it does *not fall within the category of predictions relating to the fulfilment of the covenant in the person and the rule of Jesus Christ.*

Obs. 7. Ezekiel's prediction, owing to its circumstantial relation of sacrifices, being the almost exclusive proof presented against us—if this is satisfactorily explained there can be but little difficulty with other passages. Indeed all else is more or less inferential, as is seen in Isa. 2 : 3; Isa. 60 : 1–22; Isa. 61 : 6; Isa. 66 : 21; Jer. 30 : 17–22 alleged by some to teach it, but which are susceptible of an easy and natural explanation, thus avoiding an unnecessary antagonism. These, as well as the more serious ones of Jer. 33 : 18, 21, and Zech. 14 : 16–21, are to be interpreted by the principle laid down by the apostles, and intimated even by the Spirit in the Old Test. For, aside from the simple fact that a change in the priesthood is reasonably to be anticipated in view of the change (more exalted, etc.), in the king, in the form of government, in the priests adopted specifically for the Kingdom in place of the old order, etc., *it is sufficient* to call attention to a mode of speech introduced into the Word which solves all such difficulties. It is a figure of speech called by Lord and others "hypocatastasis" by which one thing is employed as a substitute or equivalent for another.[1] This figure is employed by the prophet to portray a future existing priesthood, using for this purpose the priesthood *then* known, just as future enemies of God are presented under the names, Moab, Babylon, etc., of enemies then existing. That this is to be thus understood appears evident from the sacrifices themselves (which these priests are to offer) being used to denote another and differing form of offering or act of worship. Thus, e.g. Christ is the Paschal Lamb and the Lord's Supper is called the passover; sacrifice denotes the offering of ourselves Rom. 12 : 1, the worship or tender of the Gentiles in reception of the Gospel Rom. 15 : 16 marg. read., the devotion of faith Phil. 2 : 17, acts of benevolence or love Phil. 4 : 18, praise as the fruit of thanksgiving Heb. 13 : 15, etc. This usage of the word, 'sacrifice" shows that it is employed as *an equivalent* for worship or religious conduct in this dispensation, and to place the matter beyond all dispute it is expressly affirmed by Peter (1 Pet. 2 : 5, 9), that the design of this new order of priests, when thus gathered out and forming "a holy priesthood" "a royal priesthood," is "*to offer up spiritual sacrifices*" and not bloody ones. This again is confirmed by what is stated in Mill. descriptions, and in promises pertaining to this future priesthood. Nowhere, including the last testimony given by Jesus (*Apoc.*), do we find these priests represented as offering to God the victims of a Mosaic ritual. Hence those isolated passages which speak of worship and sacrifice, even if they are clad in language which at first sight might suggest a return to the Mosaic ritual, are to be interpreted in the light of *the more extended* predictions, of *the changes* that are to be introduced in the coming dispensation, of *the express affirmations* concerning the future priesthood, and of *the examples* given in the usage of the word "sacrifice." Otherwise an antagonism is raised, which is altogether un-

necessary, and which leads to unfriendly doubt, and to rejection of other truths. If the ancient sacrifices were typical, if they were only "a shadow of things to come," *then* we are fully warranted to regard such passages as presenting under a tropical sense (customary to all language) another kind of sacrifice, *suitable to the then existing dispensation*, and that *a new order* of priests, under the name of the old because a prolongation or continuation of a priesthood, are introduced as forever associated with Jesus in the age to come. Hence Heb. 9 : 28 will be realized.[2]

[1] These writers abundantly verify the figure, showing how a verb, act, or class of acts, or name of one kind, is used as a substitute for another that is meant. Thus, e.g. taking up the cross is equivalent to labor and self-denial, the boring Christ's ears equivalent to the pledge of His service to the Father, sinking into deep waters equivalent to being overwhelmed with sorrow, trouble, etc., plucking out the right eye equivalent to removal of prized passions that lead to sin, etc. We add to avoid misconception : this figure cannot be applied to the words Israel, Zion, etc., unless (1) we accept of the idea of a real engrafting or adoption into the elect nation thus designated, etc., (2) and observing that from the context, general tenor, etc., the same elect people are denoted, etc.

[2] Thus e.g. Zech. 14 : 16, we regard simply as the antitype or equivalent of the Jewish feast of tabernacles. The type was "a renewal of religious youth," a bringing into remembrance the past goodness of God in order to renew the claims of gratitude, love, self-consecration, and devotedness to God, and also looked to the present ingathering ; so the antitype will likewise be a joyful festival, in which there will be a public acknowledgment of indebtedness to God and praise. The feast of tabernacles being the most suitable of all feasts to express this public recalling of the past, this realization of the fulness of divine blessing, it is employed by the prophet to describe this still future joyful period. So we point the critical student to the Sabbatical year (Prop. 143, Obs. 3, and note), in which God's purpose is minutely described and *yet was never realized*, owing to the sinfulness of the nation. It indicates, however, (1) what a Theocratic ordering would have produced, (2) if the nation had been obedient and holy ; and (3) it foreshadows or typifies what ultimately on a grander scale will be carried out. So precisely with Ezekiel, which evidences what a Theocratic ordering would, on compliance with certain conditions, have resulted in, and thus foreshadows and evinces the Theocratic spirit and nearness under the Messiah in His Kingdom.

Obs. 8. The typical application, or the substitution of equivalent phraseology, is also seen in the use of the word "temple." Admitting that in the earthly Jerusalem a temple will be rebuilt in order to manifest in a public manner the worship of God, yet much confusion of ideas is found in not noticing that the way in which the word is employed fully shows, that it does *not necessarily involve* the notion of a restoration of sacrifices. The temple can exist without the introduction of the Mosaic ritual. Besides this, it has a latitude of meaning ; for, e.g. in John 2 : 19 it denotes Christ's body ; in 1 Cor. 3 : 16 ; 2 Cor. 6 : 16, it represents the saints ; in Rev. 21 : 22 it denotes the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, etc. In the latter passage John says he "saw no temple therein," excepting as God and the Lamb formed one. In Rev. 3 : 12 "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God," and in Rev. 7 : 15 the saints shall "serve Him day and night in His temple." Such expressions, as commentators abundantly show, involve no contradictions, simply indicating under the substitution of a word an equivalent denoting either a permanent union with God or Christ, or the body of the elect who are holy and worthy of honor. This teaches us, that if we are not to press the word "temple" beyond its legitimate use in the Word, so also ought we not to press the word "sacrifice" which is associated with the temple. Figures of speech, lawfully drawn from the structure of language, and indicated

thus by the Spirit, should have due weight in our interpretation. Thus, e.g. much that pertains to the dispensation still future, being beyond our present experience and knowledge, *must necessarily* be presented to us through the medium of things of which we have cognizance. But when the idea presented by the figure is legitimately drawn, it is a violation of language to engraft upon it another and additional sense, Prop. 4.

PROPOSITION 173. *This Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ may be near at hand.*

To the Spirit, speaking with that comprehensiveness mentioned by the Psalmist (Ps. 90 : 4), and Peter (2 Pet. 3 : 8), *it is near;* to man, with his ideas of the vastness of incoming ages, it is, preceded by comparatively a short period, *also near;* to the student, who carefully studies the Divine Plan, comparing the duration of dispensations, the typical hints, etc., *it is near at hand;* and to the inquirer, who considers the various predictions and intimations relating to its Coming, *it is always nigh at hand.* Before entering into the discussion of signs, etc., which (following Prop.) indicate its nearness, we may appropriately allude to some general reasons that lead to the same result.

We desire to say at the outset that the discussion of time, the nearness or remoteness of the Second Advent, does not effect in the slightest the truthfulness of the Pre-Millennial doctrine. The one is based on conjecture, or at best on approximative evidence; the other has a solid Scriptural basis. We are led to this remark because men are led to misapprehend our position. Thus e.g. the book editor of the *Luth. Observer* (Oct. 25th, 1878), in a notice of a Pre-Mill. pamphlet (*Jesus is Coming;* by W. E. B.) speaks favorably of the advocates of our doctrine as men of eminence, piety, etc., but rejects our doctrine for this one assigned reason: "But after all, the fact that the Pre-Millennial advocates and believers of all previous ages have been shown by events to have been mistaken in their interpretations, predictions, and expectations, is *a stronger argument* against the correctness of their views at the present day than anything else that can be adduced on the subject." But suppose Pre-Millenarians are mistaken as to time (just as our opponents, Barnes, etc., have been), that does not effect *the foundation* of the doctrine because the same is based—not on the express time of fulfilment—but on the plain grammatical sense of Scripture. The doctrine is *one* thing; the exact period of its realization is *another*, the former may be true, and the latter may be a mistake. Dr. Cumming in *The Great Tribulation* (p. 197), after referring to the believer's aptitude to misinterpret the signs of nearness just as a voyager on a great sea may his nearness to land, and that "if he find that he has fallen into error in so interpreting, he will not therefore despair, or give up his investigation," adds: "And far better have the character of him who intently looks, and in his intense longing treats that as a sign which is not, than the sceptic and freezing apathy of the man whose *heart is dead* and whose *hopes are cold*, and who cares for and looks for none of these things. The incidental error of a few cannot shake or shatter the trust of many; and the error that is made by one watcher for the Advent will only lead another, like a buoy upon a wreck in the channel, to avoid the reef on which his predecessor may have suffered." Hence the stress laid on "Pre-Millennial Mistakes" by a writer in the New York *Tribune* (quoted and indorsed by the *Luth. Observer*, Oct. 25th, 1878), concluding with, "All expectations of Christ's Coming for almost 2000 years have been mistakes," only indicate how *little* such persons know of *the foundations* upon which our doctrine rests. If true in their position, then it will be true to the actual Advent, and no one is encouraged to honor God's command and occupy the posture of a watching servant. Besides this, such writers conveniently ignore *the mistakes* of Anti- and Post-Millenarians.

Obs. 1. The *precise time* for the Kingdom to be established is *not given.* Men may assume this, but the language of Scripture is too precise (Mark

13 : 32, 33) : "*But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray ; for ye know not when the time is,* etc.[1] With this compare Matt. 24 : 36, 42–51 and 25 : 13 ; Luke 12 : 40, and 21 : 35, and consider that such declarations accompany or follow directions to observe *the signs* of the fulfilment of prophecy as indicative of nearness. Jesus directs us to signs to show us the time in which we live, and how near we may be to the end, and not to *definite* time, and this is also true of the apostles. The Spirit does *not contradict* Himself ; if it were possible to obtain accurate, definite time, *then* e.g. Luke 12 : 40 would be incorrect ; because some would then really know, and be thinking of the time, etc. But this very indefiniteness and uncertainty in regard to *exact time*, can be justly claimed as favoring the expectation of its nearness. If those who rely solely upon this class of passages can deduce from them the notion that the time of the Sec. Advent *is distant* (as multitudes do), we certainly, when coupling such Scripture with those referring to signs given for guidance, are not guilty of any impropriety, when we deduce the opinion that the same event *may be near*. The lack of knowledge respecting the definite time does not in itself determine either the remoteness or the nearness. If it is *an extreme* to set aside the passages referred to, and fix upon definite time,[2] it is *also one* to infer from them, that that time must be in the distant future. It being beyond our ability to give the date, *prudence*, if nothing else, ought to dictate to us that, for aught we know to the contrary, *it may be near*. The fact, too, as Gildas, Luther, etc., remarked,[3] is, that as every succeeding year and day brings us *nearer* to that which the Spirit pronounced "*nigh at hand*," so the lapse of many (1800) years has certainly brought the Sec. Advent and Kingdom *so much* the nigher to us. This is confirmed by the signs to which the Saviour directs us that have been constantly fulfilling, accumulating, and intensifying. It is reasonable, then, to conclude, and say, as we now do, that it *may be near at hand.*[4]

[1] Some press this passage beyond its meaning in another direction, viz., that Christ Himself even now does not know it. But this was spoken in His *day of humiliation*, when He *only* (John 12 : 49 and 17 : 8) uttered the words given to Him by the Father. The times and the seasons the Father had reserved (Acts 1 : 7) to Himself as a revelation *not suitable* to be presented at that period of Christ's work ; and to this Jesus alludes that the knowledge of such a time—definite time—was not suitable even for Him to express. That He knew the time is evident from several considerations, (1) by the predictions He gave concerning the Jewish nation, postponement of Kingdom, Gentile domination, expressed purposely in general terms, which, however, indicate *an intimate* acquaintance with the subject ; and (2) after his ascension, as it was proper to reveal more, the Apocalypse is given, in which, under symbolic imagery, etc., a perfect acquaintance with both events and time is evinced. In the passage there is a gradual ascending in knowledge on the subject ; man knows nothing concerning definite time—angels knowing more (as e.g. the angel revealing time to Daniel) than man, still are unacquainted with the exact day and hour, while able to form a near estimate ; Jesus, as David's Son, knows more than all, and yet even He is bound not to reveal what He knows respecting definite time because such time—its revelation—belongs to the Father. On this very difficult point a few additional remarks are in place. Some ancient Fathers, and so Wordsworth, explain that Jesus knew personally, but did not know officially ; this is argued by Pres. Mahan (*Oberlin Quarterly Review*, 1847) who insists (1) that the word "Son" denotes not merely the human nature but the divine and human united ; (2) that as divine He was omniscient—"Lord, thou knowest all things," etc. ; (3) but by virtue of His subordination as the Messiah, it was proper for Him to conceal or refuse to reveal His knowledge without special communication ; and brings in the analogy of an ambassador, who when asked in reference to things which he is instructed not to reveal, answers "I know nothing"—

not absolutely but officially; ignorance being merely relative. The older orthodox Fathers, and some moderns, teach that Christ knew as God but not as man—assuming a dualistic separation between the two natures. Some (as Alford) think that there was a real ignorance during the time of humiliation. Lange (*Life of Jesus* and *Com.*) places this in a holy unwillingness not to know, or to a self-limitation of knowledge; so also Schaff (Lange's *Com. Matt.*, p. 430, note) advocates "a voluntary self-limitation of knowledge." Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 182) in view of the union of the two natures, likewise indorses a voluntarily refraining from knowing it. Brown (*Com.*, Mark 13 : 32) says: "Some of the most eminent of the ancient Fathers, Luther, Melanchthon, most of the elder Lutherans, Bengel, Lange, Webster and Wilkinson," held "simply that it was not among the things which he had received to communicate." On the question, "whether the Son was not at that time in possession of the knowledge referred to," he says: "Chrysostom and others understood it to mean that as man our Lord was ignorant of this. It is taken literally by Calvin, Grotius, De Wette, Meyer, Fritzsche, Steir, Alford, and Alexander." Gleig (*His. Bible*, vol. 2, p. 249) makes "not to know" synonymous with "not to speak of a thing." Dr. Rutter (Rom. Cath. in *Life of Jesus*, p. 416) holds that Jesus even as man knew the time "by a knowledge inseparable from a union of his human nature with the divine person," and adopts (St. Greg. Epis. 42) this view: "But though while man He knew the day of judgment, yet this knowledge was not due to Him as He was man, or because He was man, but because He was God as well as man." He refers to the Fathers as holding that Jesus "here speaks to His disciples only as He was the ambassador of His Father, and so He is said only to know what He is to make known to men. He is said not to know, says St. Augustine, what He will not make known to others." Morris represents (Littell's *Liv. Age*, vol. 24, 4 ser., p. 443) John Gerard, a Jesuit Father, as arguing that Christ knew the day and the hour but employed equivocations. Archb. Tillotson in a sermon on this passage refers the not knowing to the human nature. It is sufficient to say that the view which best accords with the divine united with Jesus is this: the Kingdom is covenanted to David's Son, "the Son of Man." The time of the bestowal of the Kingdom and consequences of the Advent (Acts 1 : 6, 7) is in the Father's hands, and Jesus therefore speaks of the time in the covenanted direction, and refers this lack of knowledge to His *Messianic relationship* as the Son of Man and of God, as a matter *unsuitable* for Him to express, being contradictory to the state of humiliation assumed. Besides this, a revelation of the precise period of the postponement of the Kingdom, of the duration of the Gentile times, of the interval preceding the Sec. Advent, would have prevented the expression of faith, hope, and practical results afforded by the posture of constantly looking and watching for the Sec. Advent.

[2] Several writers, whom we esteem but cannot follow, make the injunction to "watch" a proof that the time can be definitely known, overlooking the simple fact that the injunction for watching is based on our alleged ignorance of the exact time. Even the illustrations given to enforce their views teach the reverse, seeing that the parties warned are presumed to be in ignorance until the signal of explosion is given, etc. It is only such who have some favorite chronological scheme to advocate who will deliberately override what *is so plainly taught.*

[3] Guildas (*Works*, s. 44), who lived about A.D. 546, quoting Isaiah as describing the speedy approach of the end, after "Howl ye, because the day of the Lord is near at hand," pertinently adds: "If so near at that time, what shall *it now* be thought to be?" Luther (quoted by Seiss, *Last Times*, p. 255) on Daniel 12 : 7 says: "I ever keep it before me, and I am satisfied that the last day must be before the door; for the signs predicted by Christ and the Apostles Peter and Paul have all now been fulfilled, the trees put forth, the Scriptures are green and flourishing. That we cannot know the day matters not; some one else may point it out; things are certainly near their end." "We certainly have nothing now to wait for but the end of all things," etc. Long ago men entertained opinions respecting the time of the year, the week, and even the day when Christ would be likely to appear. Even Luther, as is well known, held (without fixing the year) that it would be at or about Easter day. Bengel (*Gnomon, Apoc.* 1 : 10) refers to Jerome saying on Matt. 25, concerning midnight: "Let us say something which perhaps may be useful to the reader: there is a tradition of the Jews that Christ will come at midnight, in consonance with the time in Egypt, when the passover was celebrated and the destroying angel came and the Lord passed over the tents. . . . Whence I suppose" (let the reader carefully notice how this evinces the prevalence of Chiliasm) "also that the apostolic tradition has continued, that on the eve of the passover it is not permitted to dismiss the people before midnight, expecting the Coming of Christ; and when that time shall have passed, security being now presumed upon, all keep the festival." Bengel

himself inclines that the day will be the first day of the week, hence called as he alleges "the Lord's day" (others, however, as Dr. Seiss, and many others, make "the Lord's day" in Rev. 1 : 10 refer to the entire period after the Sec. Advent down to the last judgment). Jesus predicts it to be "*in that night*," as the First Advent was also acknowledged in the night.

[4] Lange's *Com. Mark*, Hom., p. 136, takes the same view that, while discarding definite time, the Saviour's language induces a certainty of His speedy and unexpected Coming, and urges the necessity of watching. Dr. Schaff (Lange's *Com. Matt.*, p. 430, note) in speaking of Jesus not knowing, regards it as "a warning against chronological curiosity and mathematical calculation in the exposition of Scripture prophecy," and then adds : "It is not likely that any theologian, however learned, should know more, or ought to know more, on this point before the end than Christ Himself, who will judge the quick and the dead, chose to know in His state of humiliation." This evidently is levelled against those who *dogmatically* assert the exact time of the Sec. Advent, but certainly is not appropriate to a study of the chronological prophecies, and the giving of an approximative opinion (which is done in the same commentary). Christ's declaration must be interpreted in harmony with the exhortations to study prophecy, the example of the prophets, and the posture of constant watching. Exact knowledge of the precise time cannot be received, no matter by whom professed, otherwise the words of Jesus would not be true, as e.g. "*Watch therefore : for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh.*"

Obs. 2. The postponement of the Kingdom is *indefinite* as to time, for where it is specifically stated it is always in connection with phraseology (such as "the times of the Gentiles," or until he comes again, etc.) which gives no regular chronological date or succession. While this is so, it is reasonable to suppose that a Gentile domination *so long* continued, a Jerusalem *so long* trodden under foot, an elect people *so long* scattered, a coming *so long* delayed, is evidence, at least, that a large portion of time included in such a postponement *has already passed*, and that therefore the Kingdom is *proportionately near*. Contrasting the respective duration of dispensations, materially aids in impressing the same idea.

It can be estimated approximatively as near because the Second Advent is a necessary antecedent (as we have shown) of predicted events which follow such periods. Thus e.g. is it not a fact that we are in the last period of the Roman Empire, a period, too, in which the Son of Man is to come and introduce that world-wide dominion? Our position, therefore, in the scale of prophetic fulfilment, is indicative of its nearness. We may consequently adopt Lange's (*Com. Matt.*, p. 433) language : "Watchfulness is above all the duty of those who bear the office of watchmen. The greater the insecurity and danger the more needful the watchfulness. Watchfulness the distinguishing characteristic of the true servants of Christ : (1) It is a tribute to the treasure, which is to be guarded ; (2) it points to conflict with an enemy ; (3) to the danger of the time of night ; (4) to fidelity in waiting for the Lord. The security of the world should arouse and keep effectually awake the servants of Christ." Cramer (p. 434) well said : "The more daring the blasphemers are in their riot and debauchery, the nearer the Lord." So also Osiander : "The more secure, the nearer the Judge."

Obs. 3. This Kingdom as we have seen in previous Propositions (as e.g. Props. 64–65) is dependent upon *a certain number of elect ones* that must previously be gathered out. After the rejection of the Jewish nation for a set time, a seed must be raised up unto Abraham to inherit the promises ; this seed is now in process of adoption, and when a *determinate* number has been thus engrafted—a sufficiency to fill out the Divine Theocratic purpose—*then* will the Kingdom come. This number requisite, *God only knows ;* it is *one of the secrets* that pertains to Himself *alone* as the bestower of the Kingdom to David's Son, and His Co-heirs, and which He has purposely clad in symbolic vesture, and in the

most general expressions. To make up this predetermined number, is assigned as a reason *why* God is delaying His promises (as e.g. 2 Pet. 3 : 9, etc.). So that by the exercise of long-suffering, men may be led to repentance, and become of the number of the elect, chosen ones. Hence, while this necessarily forbids the fixing of *a definite time*, owing to man's utter inability to fathom the Theocratic ordering of the Kingdom in its appointments, etc., yet, at the same time, the thoughtful student will feel, when looking at *the number already gathered* during eighteen centuries of contest and trial, that, at least, *a very large advancement* has been made in gathering out such a seed for Abraham to be co-inheritors with the Christ. Therefore from this even, it is *reasonable* to think that the Kingdom is *not far distant*, seeing that *already so much* has been done to secure such a class.

A writer in the *Proph. Times*, Oct. 1870, p. 150, misapprehending the design of this dispensation in gathering out an adopted seed for Abraham, etc. (Props. 59–65), makes the assertion that "prophetic times" do not belong to "the Gentile Church." This is wrong, because (1) there is *no* "Gentile Church;" and (2) the Gentiles being, by faith, engrafted and adopted are *fellow heirs* with the Jews in all the promises. Hence all prophetic announcements, etc., pertain both to Gentile and Jewish believers. We, then, may well say with Paul (Rom. 3 : 11, and comp. Olshausen *loci*) that we are constantly approaching nearer and nearer to salvation. If he could say so, much more we after so long a time.

Obs. 4. This Kingdom is dependent upon the Coming of the King, but the Advent of this King, in its several aspects, is *nowhere positively conjoined to the ending of any chronological period*, and, in view of this fact, *may be near—indeed may occur at any time.* It is true, that very many prophetical writers have presented us with chronological data, the closing of certain years (as e.g. 1260, 1290, 1335, etc.) as respectively the time of the Sec. Advent, but in every instance *as pure inference.* For no one has yet ventured to assert, that such dates have *positively* connected with them the Sec. Advent; such dates have been supposed *to imply* such an event, and the supposition has been too easily accepted as a fixed fact. Now without discussing the merits of the literal day or year day fulfilment of such dates, it is sufficient to say, that *in neither case* is the Advent (in the sense we use it, viz. as embracing dif. stages) said to occur at *the end* of such dates. So far as the period and the closing of such dates is concerned, they all are stated to embrace the history or events of either the Jewish nation, or of the Church, or of some hostile power during a certain, thus specified, time. The Sec. Advent, so far as particulars are given, and the immediate connection it may sustain even by implication to such dates, may take place some time before or after their close; and in reference to some even a length of time before they commence. It is true, and this is the reason why the mistake is made by numerous writers, that one stage or act of the Sec. Advent is directly joined to the close of some of those periods (being allied with the destruction of Antichrist and the deliverance of the Jewish nation, etc.), viz. *His visible open Coming* with His saints. But this is very different from His *previous* Coming *for* those saints, who participate with Him in the destruction of Antichrist, and thus leads us to allow *an interval* (short or long, as the case may be) *before* such a Coming in "vengeance." This teaches (see Props. 130, etc.) us not *to limit* the Sec. Advent by dates; it is not bound by them only as the last grand act of Coming for the overthrow of the Confederation is

concerned ; for, as previously intimated, Scripture surely points out that even *before* this last Confederation is formed (so e.g. Rev. 14, etc. Comp. preceding Props.), and the great tribulation is entered, that saints are removed in a manner which can only be attributed to the Sec. Advent, being specifically joined to it by the Spirit as a result. This conclusively instructs us that this Advent—concealed to the world and known only by experience to the favored ones—*precedes for a time*—not given by such dates—the visible world manifestation and destruction of Antichrist.[1] If any one asks, *why* is it not then more prominently set forth also in connection with such chronological dates, the answer is plain—such a method *would defeat* the posture of constant watching enjoined, and would, in a great measure, relieve it of a characteristic purposely designed, viz. that it shall come as "*a snare.*" A sufficiency is given to instruct us, if we will only compare Scripture : if the exact time of this first secret Coming were given, it would invalidate the express declarations that *no one* shall be cognizant of it. Hence it is, that this Coming—this Advent embracing from its first stage to the last a distinctive interval of time—is represented as one that may happen *at any time ;* one that we are to watch *for constantly ;* one that we are to look for without placing *anything intervening* (to be yet fulfilled) between it and the present, seeing that the stage or manifestation (to saints) at its beginning is never included in dates, but always enshrouded in mystery ; always represented as coming *unknown* to all men and to the angels. From this it follows, not knowing the length of this interval, and not having definite events (for those are embraced in this interval) to guide us into a recognition of the time when the Advent really begins, that such a Coming and its resultant (the Kingdom) *may be near*, so near that we dare not positively assert that it shall be delayed a single day, week, year, etc.[2]

[1] Hence it is that some sanguine writers press such passages as Dan. 12 : 9, 12 : "The words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end"—"none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand," out of all proportion. Admitting, as every student must, that knowledge will be increased (for as Sir I. Newton justly remarked, there is scarcely a prophetical writer but he adds something through his investigations to our stock of knowledge), yet it is nowhere asserted that it shall be to the extent assumed by some, viz., in reference to definite time. More than this, we more than suspect that "the time of the end" alluded to by Daniel has reference to the interval of time between the first and last stage of the Sec. Advent, a time still future, and which relates exclusively to the end (Prop. 130). At least the utmost caution and moderation ought to be exercised in this direction, least well meant labors become serious drawbacks to inquirers. We can clearly see how during that interval "the wise shall understand," and be rooted and grounded in the knowledge obtained, so that they will rather suffer martyrdom than deny the same, and also how "the wicked shall not understand" until overwhelmed by the vengeance, etc. This, however, does not forbid some knowledge respecting coming events, and a degree of knowledge, too, which makes it essential to be "watching" constantly so as to verify the promise that to some "the day of the Lord" does not come unawares or unprepared.

[2] This impresses what Lange (*Com. Matt.*, p. 433) calls "the fearful solemnity of the thought, that the Judge of the world *may come at any moment*," or (*Com. James*, p. 135) "The Coming of the Lord is nigh. Literally : it has already drawn nigh in its Coming nigh. It is not a fixed nearness but *a constant drawing nearer*, and that not in the sense of a chronological definition, but in the sense of *a religious expectation and assurance*, which does not calculate the time and the hour, or rather looks at time in the spirit of the Lord before whom a thousand years are as one day (2 Pet. 3 : 8). In the Apostles' sense of the expression, it could be said and may be said at all times : the Coming of the Lord is nigh." So Vaughan (Lange's *Apoc.*, p. 433) remarked : "The peculiarity of Christ's Coming is, that everything which seems to defer really brings it near ; every-

thing which seems to make it improbable is an argument of its certainty and of its approach. 'Behold, I come as a thief.'"

Obs. 5. While this is so, chronology itself teaches us that the Kingdom *may be near*. We admit that chronology is subject to difficulties (owing to several small chasms and uncertain dates, bringing in therefore probability, etc.)[1]; that it is so uncertain that the exact date of Christ's birth is a subject of dispute (for some extend the time from A.D. 4004 to 4128 or 4132, owing to an alleged error in Judges, etc.); that scarcely two chronologists are agreed in all respects, and that they differ in reference to the present age of the world,[2] etc., yet one thing that their valuable labors in this perplexing field has clearly stated, is the fact, that we at this day *are living on the very border of the ending of the sixth Milliad.* As to the general result, chronologers differ by a comparatively few years, one having more and others less, but the substantial agreement amid a diversity, brings forth the remarkable feature that *we are not distant from the close of the six thousandth year.* We believe that this very diversity—this inability by a unanimity to fix *the exact* closing of the sixth Milliad—the introduction of those chasms, and the obscurity of certain dates, is *intentional* in order to place us in the commanded position of *watching.* Now let the reader consider, that it was upon this ending of the sixth Milliad that the Church has *so often* through its greatest representative men *fixed her eye as the important crisis* of the world's history; let him ponder what Prop. 143 has presented, and its relationship to our present chronological position; let him even consider that from the analogy of the past it is *most reasonable* to anticipate some great movements and changes in the dispensational orderings—and from such reflections he must conclude not only that we live in a period when great changes are to be expected, but in one *not very distant* from the introduction of the predicted Kingdom of God. But in addition to this, chronology reveals another matter which forces us to the same conclusion, viz. that all writers whether Pre- or Post-Millenarians, who undertake to give us chronological calculations (we say nothing respecting their correctness)regarding the incoming Millennial age *unite* in asserting that that age *is nigh at hand.* In commentaries, prophetical treatises, etc., this is presented as something *undoubted;* and numerous writers, while giving *only approximative* dates, declare that a study of chronology in its application to prediction *necessarily* and *inevitably* leads to such a conclusion. The reason for this lies in the circumstance, that all the prophetical dates are of such *a limited* duration that no matter what plausible beginning is assigned to them, the end, in any case, *cannot* be far distant. While such dates refer to the rise, progress and overthrow of enemies, or to the struggles of the Church and her ultimate triumph, yet we find from a comparison of Scripture that to bring about the last (that is, the overthrow and triumph), the Advent of Christ is connected with the same before such a result is accomplished, leaving the time preceding it unknown, and that the same is also witnessed at the time of overthrow and triumph introductory to the Kingdom itself. Therefore linking the Advent and Kingdom to the Millennial age as accessory, prerequisite and indispensable, the admissions thus made are all of a tenor to show us that, according to the views expressed by the most intelligent and able students of various Expositions (Pre- and Post-Mill.) the Kingdom, as prophesied, *is not very distant* from us.[3]

[1] In chronology we encounter the differences existing between the Hebrew, Samaritan, Septuagint, and Josephus; the chasms from Moses' death to the first servitude (Josh. 24 : 31), and from Samuel's death to Saul's election in the Kingdom (comp. Judges 15 : 20; 16 : 31, and 1 Sam. 4 : 1; 7 : 13; 12 : 2); and the disputed point of the period of the Judges (comp. 1 Kings 6 : 1 and Acts 13 : 18–22). Whatever opinion may be deemed the most trustworthy, yet the *intelligent* student, appreciating the difficulties, will not dogmatize but simply approximate. And this is all-sufficient to urge to "watching."

[2] To indicate how largely men who make chronology a specialty differ in their estimates, we give the dates (*Time of the End*, pp. 113–115) of a tabular statement of several with the result appended. Thus Bowen has B.C. 4128 (+A. 1881=6009); Clinton, B.C. 4138 (+1881=6019); Usher, B. C. 4003 (+1881=5884); Jarvis. B.C. 4019 (+1881=5900); Cunninghame, B.C. 5478 +B.=7359); Hales, B.C. 5411 (+1881=7292); the Amer. editor, B.C. 4120 (+1881=6001). Surely in this one representation there is sufficient difference to make us feel that chronology is beset with difficulties. Numerous variations from the above exist that make it less and others more, so that but very few are found to agree either in estimates of particular dates or the final result.

[3] Some persons are disposed to ridicule the utterances of Luther, who could only put off the end at most 200 or 300 years, of Whiston, who computed the end of this dispensation for 1776, of Qurieu, for 1785, Stilling, for 1816, Bengel, Wesley, and others, for 1836, Wood, Miller, Cunninghame, and others, for 1843, Sander, Shimeall, Wolff, and others, 1847, Chytræus, Pareus, Scott, Faber, Barnes, etc., for 1866, Bickersteth, etc., for 1868, Brown, etc., for 1873, besides others for 1870, 1871, 1875, 1880, etc., and reason from such failures that the dates announced for the future (as e. g. 1883, 1885, 1893, etc.) will equally pass away without the Advent and kingdom. But the reflecting student sees no cause for ridicule in such attempts to fix, if possible, the chronological position of the Church. On the other hand, they teach him (1) that these very failures evince the propriety of constant watching, seeing the uncertainty of chronology in determining the exact time; (2) that they show how eminent men of all classes believe that we are nearing the end; (3) that past failure is no security of long postponement, and hence it would be unwise to reject a continuous testimony respecting our nearness to the end; (4) that such mistakes, while teaching us what the Spirit expressly has predicted, the inability of man to know the exact period, at the same time have a practical tendency to lead the wise to understand that the Millenarian system, in agreement with the Bible, demands, not the looking for the Advent (excepting only in its last aspect) at any definite fixed time (which alone is given by the first stage in resurrection and translation), but a constant looking, praying, and watching for it at any time. Surely, wisdom does not make itself merry at the expense of truth. Writers have endeavored to enforce the nearness of the Advent by the seven times of Lev. 26 (making 2520 years), the year of release, Deut. 15 : 1; Jer. 24 : 14 (i.e Prophetic years; $7\times360=2520$); by the typical Sabbath (i.e. Jubilee=7×7, and $49\times50=2450$); by allusion to Hos. 6 : 1–3 (i.e. after 2000 years), making Luke 13 : 32 parallel; by the 2300 days of Dan. 8 : 13, 14 (i.e. 2300 years); by the time, times, and a half of Dan. 12 : 7 (i.e. 1260 years); by the 1290 days of Dan. 12 : 11 (i.e. years); by the 1335 days of Dan. 12 : 12; by the seals, trumpets, and vials of the Apoc.; by the two witnesses of Rev. 11 : 3; the woman in the wilderness, Rev. 12 : 6, 14, the 42 months of Rev. 13 : 5, the number 666 of Rev. 13 : 18. Whatever may be said of the fanciful deductions from some of these, of the dogmatic assertions made in behalf of others, and of the erroneous conclusions exhibited in confidently expressed mathematical calculations, yet it is true that all, whether positive or approximative, whether Pre- or Post-Millenarian, infer, as a legitimate deduction, that we are very near the commencement of the Mill. era (which we hold is introduced by the personal Advent of Jesus). It is simply impossible, in view of the limited nature of the prophetic periods, and the time that has already elapsed — whatever the difficulties encountered respecting an exact beginning and ending of such periods—to come to any other conclusion. Hence a student of the Word, conversant with bearings of the subject, will not make himself merry over the mistaken chronological estimates of others, as e.g. that of 1666 (Burnet's *Lives*, p. 108); or 1694 (Evelyn's *Diary*, vol. 2, p. 342); or 1796 (Austin's theory, *Luth. Observer*, June 1st, 1877); or 1532 (Carion's view, Disraeli's. *Cur. of Lit.*, vol. 3, p. 272); or 1786 (Napier, Lord, etc.); or 1716 or 1717 (Mede, etc.); or 1793–94 (Mann); or 1798 (Valpy); or 1789 (Bichino); or 1800 (Sharpe); or 1656 (in *A Voice out of the Wilderness*, by M. S.); or 1843–44 (Habershon); or 1873 (Balfour, Russell, etc.); or 1878 (Swormstedt); or 1870 (Mahan); or 1872 (Bowen, Scott, etc.); or 1880 (Hales); or 1881 (Brothers, Bliss, etc.); or 1881–82 (in the pyramid theory by Smyth, Piazzi, and others), etc. So likewise the estimates made concerning the future, whether

dogmatic or approximative, do not affect the constant posture of the obedient watching servant; as e.g. the date 1890 (*Chr. Herald*, Feb. 17th, 1881, in an Art.); or 1935 (Wild, *The Lost Ten Tribes*, p. 193); or 2016 (Lowman's Apoc.); or 1902-47 (Clarke); or 1987 (Newton); or 1966 (Ralston); or 2018 (Fleming); or 1885, 1887, etc., given by others. Such a diversity of expression is precisely that which we ought reasonably to anticipate, if it is true that—as we have advocated—the Father has, for wise reasons, reserved the exact time within His own knowledge.

Obs 6. It is important to notice that this indefiniteness as to the exact time is to the thoughtful not only evidence of the inspiration of the Word, but a reason *why* the end should always be regarded as near. Let the student compare the chronological dates, and see how they are presented, *purposely* in a form so obscure or hidden, that the wisest of scholars admit a degree of uncertainty appertaining to a decided apprehension of the same; and yet so framed in with the text of prediction given by various prophets that they harmonize with it and each other, and he must conclude that men, separated from each other by ages, etc., could not unaided have given to us such *a wonderful combination*, so *indefinite* as to *exact* time, and yet *so definite* as in the general course *to point each age* to a future that was imminent. Such a framework, which caused the early Church, the later Fathers, and able men in every successive century to apprehend the nearness of the Advent and events following, *is not accidental*. It is *designed* by the Spirit in order to bring forth the commanded posture of believers, viz. *to be constantly looking* (Phil. 3 : 20; Heb. 11 : 28; 2 Pet. 3 : 12, 14, etc.) for such a Coming in view of its *practical* influence (as e.g. Phil. 3 : 20; Col. 3 : 4, 5; 1 Tim. 6 : 14; 2 Tim. 4 : 1, 2, 8; 1 Pet. 5 : 4.) of its being *the great hope* of the Church (as e.g. Tit. 2 : 12, 13; 1 Pet. 1 : 13; Col. 2 : 4) etc. Suppose that a precise unmistakable date were given; *then* many commands (as e.g. Matt. 24 : 43–51 and 25 : 13; Mark 13 : 33–37, etc.) could not be observed; *then* those exhortations to be in constant readiness for it (as e.g. Luke 12 : 35, 36, 40, and 21 : 34, etc.) would lose their force; because it would be impossible to watch, etc., as the Spirit enjoins (for our personal good) until the time stated definitely had come. (Therefore well-meaning persons who give positive dates *in so far* violate Scripture, and do injury to others, because instead of watching *every day* they wait for *specific time*, etc.) Now the singular and most striking feature in the matter consists in this, that while the Spirit gives us certain chronological data, yet they are presented in such a manner as not *to conflict* with the assigned posture of constant watching. Hence, we have not only a defence for the logical position of the Primitive Church (aided too, no doubt by the use of the Sep. chronology which made the end much nearer) but an excuse even for that class of writers (as Bengel, Wesley, Elliott, etc.) who approximatively fixed the period and failed in definite time; because they maintained the scriptural injunction of constant looking for the Advent, etc., and gave their views as to time simply as *an opinion*, not proven but uncertain, without denying the possibility of *an instant, immediate Coming*. Surely it is to the honor of commentators (as e.g. Barnes) that while approximatively fixing the time of the ushering in of the Millennial age (as an expression of opinion when dealing with chronological dates), yet, they deem even such an approximation so liable to mistake that in other portions they exhort to an observance of the attitude of watching, freely and fully admitting the possibility of Christ's Coming *at any time*. From the arrangement, therefore, of the

Scriptures in that chronology and the command to constant watchfulness sustain each other, and which is confirmed by the experience of the past, it would be *unreasonable* and *unscriptural* if we did *not acquiesce* in maintaining such a position ; and, in view of our want of definite knowledge, *insist upon it*, that the Advent and Kingdom *may be nigh at hand.* When the apostolic Fathers wrote (as e.g. Clement) " Let us *every hour* expect the Kingdom of God ;" When the Reformers (as e.g. Luther) long after said : " Though the signs may seem uncertain, yet no man can despise them *without* danger ; seeing there can be not only *no* danger, but also *great profit*, if, reckoning them as true, thou shalt *prepare* thyself to meet thy Saviour ; that is, if, bidding farewell to present things, thou shalt be *wholly taken up* with the desire of the Kingdom of God that is Coming ;" when eminent men in Europe, America, etc., at this day proclaim that " *the Coming of the Lord draweth nigh ;*" all these only occupy the position and maintain the attitude *assigned to believers.*

We cannot but feel that as at the First Advent there was a widespread opinion that the Messiah should come (based chiefly on chronology, Dan. 9 : 24), so at the Second Advent it is *reasonable* to expect the same result to follow. It is a matter of amazement that even unbelief, pertinently but in ignorance, honors this scriptural feature by appropriating its language and time. Thus, Woodhull and Claflin's *Weekly* (New York, 1876) has for a motto on the first page : " In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, the mystery of God shall be finished." Papers, too, from which we do not expect very strong Pre-Millennial assertions occasionally enforce our position. Thus, e.g. " An Inquirer" in the *Ch. Union* (Jan. 2d, 1878) asks to be enlightened respecting the hope in a speedy Advent expressed by the Apostles. The editor replies : " The Apostles were taught by the Lord to expect His Coming ; to wait and watch for it. What He said to them, He also says to us : ' What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.' But it was not disclosed to them any more than it is to us when that Coming should take place. Christ Himself did not know (Mark 13 : 32). Their uncertainty led them to watch, and hope, and expect, not with certainty but with yearning, and they were not inspired to know when it should be ; therefore they lived *in perpetual expectation.* They lived as children whose father is at sea, who watch *every day* for his coming, hoping from day to day because they do not know when the ship will come in " The same paper (Feb., 1878) in reply to what the Scriptures teach concerning the Sec. Advent, says : " The orthodoxy which declares that Christ cannot come, and the Sec. Adventism which declares that He must come within a specified time, equally run counter to the scriptural command, ' Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh.' " Certainly those who hold such sentiments cannot consistently intervene a thousand years (Mill. era) between the present and the Advent ; and they cannot with propriety—if practically believed—preach " peace and safety." Sir Th. Browne (*Religio Medici*, sec. 45) quaintly remarks : " I believe the world grows near its end ; yet is neither old nor decayed, nor will ever perish upon the ruin of its own principles." (He advocated mutation, and declared it impossible for any one to fix the precise time of the change, etc.) The Earl of Carlisle (*The Sec. Vision of Dan.*) only expresses the opinion of a multitude, when he affirms : " The high probability, when this chapter is viewed in connection with the associated prophecies and chronologies of the Book of Daniel and of the Revelation, is that we are even now upon the threshold of great events, and of the close of our present economy." (See next Prop., where others are given.)

Obs. 7. It is suitable in this connection to advert to the methods by which the scripturally enjoined posture of watching for the Advent (which precedes the Kingdom) is *violated.* (1) This is done by those who either locate such an Advent in *the past* (as e.g. at destruction of Jerusalem, etc.) or else spiritualize it away as *something constantly taking place* in the Church, or as something *very different* from the biblical descriptions of it. It is not necessary, in view of previous Propositions, to dwell upon this point. (2) Others interpose between this and the possible occurrence of the

Advent a definite date. Cheerfully admitting that in Commentaries, Expositions, etc., in which prophetical dates are necessarily involved, it is eminently proper to discuss and explain them within the limits of probability, yet this is very different from that *positive*, *dogmatic* assertion that such or such a date is the correct one, and that consequently the Advent *can only take place at such a fixed time.* It will be found, too, that *the more positive* this class is, *the less credence* are we to bestow upon them, because they evidently are unacquainted with *the difficulties* pertaining to their subject. Nearly all writers upon chronology and prophetical dates have manifested commendable modesty, and while giving in their judgment *an approximation* to the truth, do not conceal from themselves or readers the difficulties connected with the subject. To this class our remarks do not apply, for it is only the former, who, by such *positiveness*, do injury to the truth: first, by leading men away from *a daily looking* for the Advent to *a particular time* for such watching: and, secondly, by causing those who have but a slight knowledge of prophecy to turn away from the whole subject through disgust, etc., induced by *the failures in positive time.* If moderation should characterize writings upon any subject whatever, it certainly ought to be upon this one.[1] (3) Others again interpose between us and the Advent *the fulfilment of certain events* as prerequisites. We are thus led to watch *for these events* instead of looking *for the Advent;* and the latter instead of being liable, as the Scriptures represent, to come *at any time* (so to us on account of the lack of definite knowledge, but to God a definite time), cannot possibly take place without *the previous* arrival of forerunning events. Having already shown how this mistake arises (viz. by looking only at the last stage of this Advent before the ushering in of the Mill. age), it is sufficient now to say, that it *virtually neutralizes* commands directly appertaining to the Advent, and for this Advent substitutes other particulars. This is misleading (however, honestly and sincerely intended), and causes many to interpose several events, *as certain to happen* between the present time and Sec. Coming, thus *delaying* the latter. It is significant, and we most gladly record it, that writers of ability in this and other countries, are so impressed with this point, that they insist upon it, that *no event whatever* is to be thus interposed lest it prove "*a snare*" to put us off our guard. Indeed, we may add, that the Coming of Eljiah as promised in Mal. 4 : 5, 6—upon which some lay so much stress as a positive interposition of a coming event before (as a Forerunner) the Sec. Advent—is something that *follows* the first stage of the Advent. It cannot precede for a number of reasons, among which are these: that it would be inconsistent with the secret, concealed Advent of Christ; that it would be contrary to the state of faith and unpreparedness, etc., of the Church and world; that it would violate the order of events alleged as preceding the Advent, as e.g. in the actual condition of the Jews, etc. The truth seems to be, that Eljiah is a Forerunner of Jesus, not to the Gentiles but, as John, *to the Jewish nation;* his mission pertains to them exclusively, and has no reference whatever to the Church as now constituted. Hence, observing the condition of the Jews down to this first stage of the Advent, which shows that *no* such mission has to that time been undertaken among them (the proof is that they are to suffer fearfully under the Antichrist, being also left for this purpose), we conclude, that Eljiah's Coming is at some period during the interval between the first and last stages of the Advent (and we strongly

incline to the opinion but a short time before the last stage) in order to prepare the Jews for the open visible manifestation of the King with His saints. This is confirmed by the nature of the first stage of the Advent, which is designed specially for the Church, and is only preparative for what follows respecting the nation. Thus, in brief, it will be found, by comparison of the Word, that every event which is alleged to precede the Advent, and is really sustained by Scripture as something to take place, finds its appropriate location during this interval.[2] (4) Others, however, not content with simply interposing a few events between the present and the Advent, actually include *the entire Millennial era* as elapsing *before* the Sec. Advent can be reasonably expected. As this is a popular view and extensively prevailing, it will be proper to illustrate the inconsistency which it entails in interpreting the Scripture relating to the last things. For this purpose we again select Barnes's *Com.* (because of its popularity and the high standing, correctly too, of its amiable author), directing attention e.g. to his comments upon Phil. 3 : 20. After describing it as "one of the characteristics of the Christian that he believes that the Lord Jesus will return from heaven, and that he looks and waits for it:" that this was the firm belief and attitude of the early Christians—a leading doctrine resultant in good—and that "it may be asked, *with great force*, whether Christians in general have now any such expectation of the second appearing of the Lord Jesus, or whether they have not fallen into *the dangerous error* of prevailing unbelief, so that the expectation of His Coming is allowed to exert *almost no influence* upon the soul," he proceeds to contrast such unbelief and refusal to look for the Advent with the early Church, and then adds: "*So we should look*," but neutralizes the whole by asserting that this relates only to looking for a Sec. Advent *without reference to the time* of that Coming. For, his *Com.* develops the theory of an intervening Millennium followed by the Sec. Advent. Such a passage, therefore, he correctly explains but shifts it in order to fit, if possible, his Millennial theory. There are, however, passages which he cannot thus reconcile, and the attempt is not made to do this, as e.g. 1 Thess. 5 : 5, 6, "But let us watch, that is, for the Coming of the Lord. Let us regard it as an event which is *certainly to occur; and which may occur at any moment*," etc.; Tit. 2 : 13, "we are to be in a posture of expectation, *not knowing when He will come*," etc. (comp. his comments on 2 Pet. 3 : 12 etc.). Accepting of his comments thus given it is simply *impossible* to expect the Advent to take place "at any moment" with *the reservation* of at least an intervening one thousand years.[3] The same exhortations to watch, etc., for the Advent, while a Millennial age is advocated to precede it, is to be found in various commentaries, and not one of them endeavors to reconcile or remove the involved *self-contradiction*. This much, however, we learn from the admissions and concessions forced upon writers, who would gladly for the sake of theory not make them, that the Kingdom of the prophets is not so distant but what the events preceding it may suddenly burst upon us "*at any moment*."[4]

[1] While running into an extreme yet we may admire at least the spirit of a certain Rabinnical interdiction, designed to remove an evil. To check the rise of false Messiahs and a morbid curiosity respecting the time of the Messiah's Advent, some writers tell us that an interdict was repeated at one time in the synagogues. "Cursed is he who calculates the time of the Messiah's Coming." This, however, did not preclude a constant looking for His Coming. Again, we have noticed, that if a Millenarian has fallen into

some error respecting date, it is jubilantly seized and paraded by a class of religious papers as the strongest evidence that the whole Chiliastic scheme or doctrine is unworthy of credence ; but these papers are careful never to allude to the failures *of their own class*, commentators, etc., in this field, as e.g. in reference to the nearness of the Mill age, etc. The fact is, that such failures prove nothing respecting the doctrine of either party, but pertain solely to the then one point, viz., chronological subject in hand.

[2] We are forced to differ from many esteemed writers, not being able to accept either of the dates, or the events, that they *intervene* between the present and the Second Advent. Some interpreters most confidently inform us that certain events (as e.g. the pouring out of some vials, the formation of the confederation, the gathering of the kings of the earth, etc.) must first transpire *before* the Advent. The favorite event with many is the restoration of the Jews. To illustrate the latter : Wilson (*Proph. Times*, July, 1877, p. 167) in answer to the question, " Do you think our Lord will come as a thief before the restoration of Israel ?" says, " No. His Coming to take His saints out of the earth will not take place till this dispensation ends, and this dispensation will not end till Israel is restored. The restoration of the Jewish nationality will be effected *before* the Coming of the Lord, but how long *before* no one can tell. And it will be to all true believers *the sign* that the Coming of the Lord is near, even at the doors. When it does take place we will lift up our heads with rejoicing." This is misleading, directing our watching to signs intervening and not to the Advent. It contains several errors. (1) Christ's Coming is most certainly *before* this dispensation ends, as seen e.g. in the removal of saints, in the preparative acts, in the existing Gentile domination overthrown *after* His Coming, etc. (2) He mistakes the *partial* restoration *before* the open manifestation, which according to Zechariah is doomed to sore tribulation, for the restoration which *follows* the Advent under the Messiah (for proof, see Props. 111, 112, 113, 161, etc.). (3) This dispensation will not end until Antichrist is destroyed, until the restoration under the Messiah personally is effected, until the covenanted Davidic throne and Kingdom is restored, etc., and the Advent necessarily precedes these events. (4) Even the partial restoration of the Jewish nation under the auspices of some nation has no chronological connection with the thief-like Coming of Christ. (5) Jesus comes in " the times of the Gentiles," hence in this dispensation. (6) Jesus removes saints from a coming persecution, hence in this dispensation. (7) Christ comes *with* His saints in aid of a partially restored nation, hence in this dispensation. (8) The thief-like Coming is not discoverable by a particular sign, but is impressed by general ones (for proof, next Prop.). If persons incautiously wait for this alleged sign, they may and will be most wofully deceived. We dare not substitute anything in place of the Advent.

[3] Barnes, as well as other commentators, involve themselves in numerous inconsistencies. In order to their future avoidance it is thus requisite to notice them. To present another illustration : On Rev. 10 : 7 Barnes fully admits that " Then—at the time when the seventh angel should sound—would be *the consummation* of all things." This view is repeated on Rev. 11 : 15, etc. But if this is so, he forgets to inform us why, according to his theory of a lengthy Millennial period intervening, such a vast disproportion in time should exist between this and former trumpets ; why, if the consummation then takes place, it should be postponed for thousands of years ; why, if the Millennial glory thus precedes " the end," there should be such a consummation as he advocates to follow, etc. Such discrepancies are conveniently ignored, although hostile to his theory.

[4] Wilson (*Proph. Times*, July, 1877, p. 168), in order to invalidate our position, utters the following half truth, viz., that " the Coming of Christ is not capricious, that ' it may occur at any moment ; ' it is a fixed event which cannot take place *until the time appointed.*" This is true so far *as God* is concerned, for He, knowing definitely the time, cannot look for it at " any moment." This feature we have fully advocated, and repeatedly shown that it cannot occur until certain times and events, *known definitely only to God*, are fulfilled. But this is not true *of man*, for owing to his lack of knowledge it may to him " occur at any moment." Man indeed cannot hasten or retard it, and this very feature confirms our position. The principal passage that Wilson relies on to make the Advent subsequent to this dispensation is Matt. 24 : 14. But this Scripture does not embrace his order ; it only shows the end to come without giving the manner *how* it is to be brought about. In other passages we find that the Advent itself is one of the means to introduce " the end." All that the passage teaches is that the preaching of the Gospel as a witness precedes " the end." Hence on page 184 to enforce his interpretation he makes " the times of the Gentiles" *to end before* the Coming of the Lord ; but that this is a wrong inference is self-evident from the simple fact that *after* Christ's open manifestation a fearful Gentile domination, crushing God's people, exists, and that Jesus Himself, *after* His Revelation, ends the Gentile times.

Obs. 8. That interpretation of the Scriptures is the only correct one, which can truly and freely accept of *all* the divine utterances without the least attempt to soften them, or to explain them away, or to receive them with a sort of mental reservation. The test in this case is the incorporation of and using without contradiction, *the identical phraseology* of the Bible. Any theory which cannot do this, is *most certainly defective,* and open to the gravest objection ; especially is this true of the last things in view of the mighty issues resulting therefrom. An Eschatology which leaves out the biblical exhortations respecting *the nearness* of the day of the Lord Jesus Christ, and our duty to watch for it, really takes *the life out of the subject,* and gives us but a cold dead body for faith and hope to grasp. Those who do this, strive to make amends by so exalting the intermediate state and the condition of the saints, that if we were to credit them, the Advent itself is of *comparatively little consequence* so far as the increased happiness and honor of the saints is concerned. This however is *anti-scriptural,* and hence we reject all theories which would disparage or lower, or set aside "*the blessed hope,*" and the language employed in reference to it. Our position is one that cordially embraces *the exact phraseology* of the Bible, and glories in the same. It is precisely the one exemplified in the history of the early Church, so that to-day we can say with Clement (*First Epis.*, ch. 35) : "Let us therefore earnestly strive to be found in the number of those *that wait for Him,* in order that we may share in the promised gifts," or, (Sec. Epis. ch. 12) "Let us expect, therefore, *hour by hour the Kingdom of God* in love and righteousness, since *we know not* the day of the appearing of God." The adoption of Scripture phraseology with hearts of faith, the cordial reception and belief in the language given by inspired men, leads us to *the same* logical position occupied by the primitive Church.

Hence we admire the faithfulness of the Reformers and others in insisting upon and retaining the biblical idea of *constant watching* for the Advent. Thus (quoted Lange's *Com. Thess.*, p. 87) e.g. "*Zwingli:* The Lord hides from us this day, that we may *continually watch, and never relax* through ease and the immoderate desire of pleasure ; *Calvin:* that we may stand *ever upon the watch.*" So Burkitt : "That we may be on our watch *every hour.* . . . *No hour* when we can promise ourselves that He will not come." For expressions from Luther, Melanchthon, etc., see Barnes's *Rev.*, p. 292, etc., Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, Lord's *Apoc.*, Seiss's *Last Times,* Taylor's *Voice of the Church, Time of the End,* by a Congregationalist, Bickersteth's *Guide,* Brookes's *El. Proph. Interp.*, Michelet's *Life of Luther,* B. 2, ch. 5, and also pp. 255, 257, 290, 342, 344-45, etc. See likewise an art. in *The Presbyterian,* July 6th, 1881, entitled, "John Knox," in which is given Knox's belief (drawn from *The His. of the Martyrs, Epitomized,* 2 vols., 1747) in the nearness of the Advent, in the duty of believers to watch and pray, and look for the speedy Coming ; and in its power to console the Church, being a blessed hope.

Obs. 9. The student who passes over the history of the Church, keeping in view the utterances of her eminent leading minds respecting the nearness of the end, will be surprised at the lengthy catalogue presented. Indeed we have books (such as Taylor's *Voice of the Church, The Time of the End,* by a Congregationalist, Bickersteth's *Guide to the Prophecies,* Seiss's *Last Times,* etc.), which give us *hundreds* of names, taken from all denominations, proclaiming this nearness. The reader is referred to such works for extracts indicative of the same. Having alluded to many under the Props. pertaining to the history of Millennial doctrine, we may briefly say here that such an expectation is far from being confined to Millenarians. Thus e.g. even many of those who make the Millennium in Rev. 20 spiritual

and already past, still hold to the view expressed by Bishop Hall (Bickersteth's *Guide*, p. 184) : " For my part, I am persuaded in my soul, *that the Coming of our Saviour is near at hand.*" Many also who rigidly hold to the teaching of Luther, or to that of the Fathers as Augustine, Chrysostom, Jerome, etc., still declare with Luther (Walch's *Luth.*, 13 vols. Cols. 34–43 on Luke 21 : 25–36) " the Lord admonishes us Christians not to place the date of our lives here upon the earth, but to know that our Lord and Redeemer shall come from heaven, and thus be prepared *every hour to expect His Coming ;* likewise, that we should be but half, and with the left hand, in this world, while with the right hand, and with the whole heart, we are *in waiting* for that day when our Lord shall come in His glorious majesty and power, which no man can describe." " Let us have respect to the words of Christ and *expect* His Coming," etc. (Comp. Barnes's *Notes on Rev.* 10 : 6.) Besides this large class, there is another still larger, who, while spiritualizing the Millennium and locating it in the future, yet, frankly admit the possibility of the nearness of the Advent, etc., by exhorting to a constant watchfulness for the same. Having already illustrated this feature from the writings of Albert Barnes, the reader is directed to another drawn from Dr. David Brown (the more valuable, since he has specially written against the Millenarian doctrine), in his work, *Christ's Sec. Coming.* In this work we are expressly assured (p. 27–29) that in reference to the Millennial period, " the same *uncertainty* overhangs this as all the great periods of the Divine economy ;" and he informs us (p. 32–33) that it is a plain Scriptural injunction *to look, wait, watch and pray* for the coming of Christ, quoting Wodrow approvingly : " Hence we are commanded *to be looking for and hasting unto* the Coming of the day of God ; hence it is the closing prayer of the Church, ' *Even so, come, Lord Jesus ;*' and hence it should be often the prayer of believers, individually and collectively, ' *Make haste,* my beloved, and be thou like a roe or a young hart upon the mountain of spices.' " Literally, volumes could be filled with the testimony given by able divines and scholars upon this subject. The commentaries of greatest ability such as Bengel's *Gnomon*, Olshausen, Alford, Lange, Meyer, Stier, Greswell, Ebrard, and others, now in general use, are so well known to be in sympathy with our views in this respect that it is unnecessary to quote passages from them. The same is true of the class in a measure superseded by others, but still containing much that is valuable, such as Clarke's, Gill's, Coke's, Calvin's, Benson's Henry's, Wesley's, and others, which present exhortations to *a constant watching* for the Advent, that can only be grounded (also expressed) on a belief in *its nearness*, or that it may take place *at any time.* It would be a pleasure, had we space, to present extracts from these, and many others, whose praise is in all the churches. The intelligent reader, no doubt is aware, that the ablest of scholars and divines both in this country and Europe, have expressed the decided opinion that we are rapidly nearing the end of this dispensation, or approaching the greatest crisis in the world's history. In recent books, tracts, and periodicals, lengthy communications and extracts appear from such men as Candlish, Newton, Hitchcock, Spurgeon, Duff, Archd. Browne, Bh. Tillotson, Tyng, Bonars, Bh. Chase, Krummacher, Elliott, Faber, Bh. McIlvaine, Wilson, Duffield, Stephenson, Bh. Henshaw, in brief, from hundreds representing various denominations and forms of belief, but *all united* in the proclamation of *the nearness* of Christ's Coming, and insisting upon our occupying the posture of watching

servants. Many of these extracts, etc., we have verified by actual reference ; others we receive upon the authority of reliable writers. The time has gone by, in view of such unanimity among the intelligent and learned, for any one to discard the subject as one confined simply to a party or sect, or as one the result of ignorance and folly. *When* authors like Auberlen, Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofman, Luthart, Van Oosterzee and others, do not hesitate to express themselves *decidedly* as favoring the shortness of time between us and the Advent ; *when* leading preachers (as Cummings, Tyng, McNeile, Noel, Cox, Dallas, Gordon, Demarest, Forsyth, etc.), pointedly preach the speedy Advent ; *when* able popular writers (as Ryle, Trench, Birks, Stier, Brookes, Margoliouth, Tregelles, McCaul, etc.), make the nearness to the Advent "*the generation truth ;*" *when* ecclesiastical bodies (as e.g. Pan-Anglican Conf. held at Lambeth and embracing such biblical scholars, etc., as Trench and Bhs. Ellicott, Wilberforce, Browne, Selwyn, Talbot, Lay Quintard, etc.), solemnly in a synodical letter declare, "Brethren beloved, with *one voice* we warn you ; *the time is short ; the Lord cometh ; watch and be sober ;*" *when* many of the faithful sons of the Church plant themselves on the Scriptural basis announced by Candlish (*Lect. on Genesis*, Lect. 17) : "*Looking for Christ now is waiting for Him with 'loins girt and lamps burning.'* It is watching also, as *not knowing at what hour* the Master may come ; but yet 'knowing the time, that *now it is high time* to awake out of sleep,' (Rom. 13 : 11)"—surely even the gathered testimony of *so many* of God's people, running continuously from the early Church down to the present, and becoming within the last twenty years *intensified* (as evidenced by the numerous books, pamphlets, tracts, periodicals, etc., published in order to uphold it), corroborates our position—being in accord with Bible language and command—viz., that the Advent and, as a result, the Kingdom *may be nigh at hand.*[1] As already intimated, the lapse of time, since this expectation was excited in believers, should certainly cause us to infer, that we living at this period ought to feel that "*the little while*" of Paul (Heb. 10 : 37) has certainly been greatly diminished, and this, adopting the inference of the same apostle (Heb. 10 : 25), "*so much the more as ye see the day approaching.*"[2]

[1] Even the Jews believe (the orthodox portion) that the time of their restitution is not far distant, and that the Coming of the Messiah is near. In various publications have we noticed this belief expressed, as e.g. in Miss. of Inq. to the Jews, p. 13, it is said that the Jews in Jerusalem have a strong hope of Messiah's soon Coming. In several places the same hope was stated, as entertained, to the Committee of Inquiry. Some Jewish Rabbis in Russia and other places (p. 402) take advantage of this belief in a speedy Coming of the Messiah in the way of exalting themselves as special favorites of that Messiah who shall visit, stay with them, etc. Some even as Bauske in Courland (mentioned by Colman Miss.) and others, pretend to be a sort of forerunners. Rabbi Sol. Spitzer, of Vienna, has published (so *Luth. Observer* of Aug. 9th, 1872) the decisions of four hundred Rabbis of Germany, Austria, and Russia, who all agree that the "omission of prayers for the Advent of the Messiah and the restoration of the sacrifices, involves a denial of the heavenly promises, and that those who omit such prayers are not allowed to become members of the religious body." Rabbi Carillon, of Jamaica Island, affirms (*Proph. Times*, vol. 1, p. 3) that "there is every reason to believe that the latter days are not far off ; let us, therefore, be on the watch and in continual prayer." The same is said to be the position of Rabbi Sol. Herschel, of London, and of others. The writer noticed that in the reception of a convert by the Jewish synagogue through the Rabbi Messing (described in *Nathaniel*, vol. 13, p. 18, 19) at Chicago, Feb. 20th, 1869, one of the questions asked was the following: "Are you acquainted with the Articles of Faith of our nation?" The reply of the candidate was in the affirmative, and as evidence the

articles were repeated, one reading : " I believe with a perfect faith, that the Messiah will come, and, although His Coming will be delayed, I will still *in daily hope* patiently await His appearance." (Comp. *Forty Years in the Turkish Empire*, Goodell's memoirs by Prime, p. 241 ; Read's *God in History*, p. 353 ; the " Chasidim or Pietists," art. on, *Ency. Rel. Knowl. ;* Gibbon's *Decl. and Fall*, vol. 2, p. 4 ; *The Life of Leila Ada*, p. 24 and 33, who says respecting the nearness of the Messianic Advent expressed by some Rabbis, " that this feeling is becoming very general among Jews in Germany and other parts of Europe, and also in Africa ; art. " Caraites," *Ency. Rel. Knowl.*, etc.). Periodicals like *Nathaniel*, *The Proph. News*, *The Proph. Times*, etc., contain various quotations and references indicative of such a feeling existing.

[2] We may conclude with Lange's declaration (Matt. p. 430) : " ' Therefore be ye also ready—Because it is the fundamental law of watchfulness to be *always* watching ; and because the Son of Man will be generally unexpected when He comes—*therein* like a thief in the night, that is, at a time when the world will be buried in profound sleep." The contemplation and study of these things ought, therefore, to excite no prejudice in the mind of a believer. We give as illustrative of this spirit the injunctions of two writers, one a Post and the other a Pre-Millenarian. Scott (*Com.* Rev. 1 : 3), even in reference to the most difficult and the most decided of prophecies, remarks : it " seems to have been prophetically intended to obviate or answer the objections, and obliquy, and ridicule which would, in after ages, be raised against the study of this mysterious book, and all endeavors to bring others acquainted with it." Craven (Lange's *Com.*, Rev. 1 : 3) says : " These words imply the duty of striving *to understand*—a duty still further implied by the direction *to keep*. How can that be *kept* which is not *understood?* There are those who refrain from the study of unfulfilled prophecy upon the ground that ' the prophecies were not designated to make us prophets.' This is true ; but a prophet is one thing, and an understander of prophecy is another. There is, indeed, a curious prying into things not revealed, an effort to make determinate those times and seasons which our Lord has expressly declared are (for us) left indeterminate (comp. Matt. 24 : 36, Acts 1 : 7). Such conduct, however, is entirely different from the reverential, prayerful study of the Word *as revealed*. It should be remembered that our Lord rebuked the Jews and His disciples for *not* understanding the prophecies relating to His First Advent (comp. John 5 : 39, 46 ; Luke 11 : 52 ; Matt. 16 : 3 ; Luke 24 : 25) ; and that His last great eschatological discourse was delivered that His people might be *forewarned* (comp. Matt. 24 : 4, 15, 24, 25, 33), the implication, of course, being *that it should be studied*. It is not intended by these remarks to assert that a full and complete understanding of all prophecies will be attained to, by all who faithfully study ; their design is to set forth the duty of study. Doubtless many things will remain dark to the most earnest students, even to the beginning of the end ; it may be confidently believed, however, that to such *much important knowledge* will be vouchsafed which will be withheld from the negligent ; and, furthermore, that all knowledge expedient for them to possess will be granted." Some indeed press scriptural language beyond its intent in order to sustain some definite time theory, as e.g. 1 Thess. 5 : 1-8, " But ye, brethren, are *not in darkness*, that that day should overtake you as a thief." For it is self-evident (1) that the Thessalonians did not obtain definite time and yet were " not in darkness ;" (2) that the practical knowledge obtained, leading to preparation and watchfulness, caused the Apostles' declaration ; (3) that the assurance thus given points to their Pre-Mill. resurrection. Hence the faith that we insist upon, so far as the believer's posture is concerned, is thus expressed by Poor (Lange's *Com.* 1 *Cor.*, p. 26) : " The Sec. Advent of Christ is possible for any generation, and ought *constantly* to be looked for, desired, and prayed for." (Comp. e.g. the utterances of Van Oosterzee, Löhe, Brentius, etc., in Lange's *Com. Luke*, p. 326, etc.).

PROPOSITION 174.—*This Kingdom of the Messiah is preceded by signs.*

This, intimated in the last Proposition, has been so clearly announced in Scripture and has been so constantly the belief of the Church (as related to the Sec. Advent, which, as we have shown, necessarily precedes the Kingdom), that it deserves separate and careful notice owing to its importance in confirming *the nearness* of the Kingdom, and in urging us to occupy the commanded position of *watching* servants.

Riggenbach (Lange's *Com.* 1 *Thess.*, p. 86) comments: "In exact accordance with Christ's teaching, the Apostle declines all close definition or calculation of the times, and points instead to *the signs* which the disciples of Christ are required to consider. For those secure in their ungodliness there are no signs; on them the thief comes suddenly, the pangs seize them all at once. But they themselves are for *a sign* to believers who watch and observe. It is the triumph of the cause of God that even the despisers must render it the service of their testimony. Stupidity in divine things, security and self-confidence increase more and more; as it was, says Christ, in the days of Noah and Lot (Luke 17 : 26, etc.). They ate, they drank, they married and were given in marriage; thus Jesus does not once upbraid them with the scandalous crimes which they committed, but with that very thing in their way of life which was commendable, but which becomes hideous, when nothing higher can be told of an age; when its whole life is *a worldly life*, in which God is no longer taken in account. A great increase of outward power and culture, reliance on science, industry, the conquest of the external world, lead to an arrogance that no longer admits its dependence on God."

Obs. 1. Storr (*Diss. on Kingdom*), justly says, that Jesus "is ready and prepared to make the exhibition of His Majesty *whenever* it pleases Him," and then in a footnote referring to Christ's Coming unawares to some, adds: "But as this time was to be unknown; teachers merely human could not exhort to watchfulness those during whose lifetime the destined period for retribution will be just at hand, *unless* they gave this advice to men of all periods of the world." But this is only giving us part of the truth, viz., that it is also the pleasure of Jesus that men should attentively consider and ponder *the signs* preceding the exhibition of His Majesty, and that men should be exhorted to watchfulness *by the concurrent signs* around them. While the exact time is known only to God, yet in accommodation to our weakness, and to urge us to the attitude so honorable toward Himself and so provocative of piety, He graciously points out to us *approximative signs* indicative of its nearness. That some, or even all, of these signs are characteristic, more or less, of *every succeeding generation*, forms no valid objection to their rejection, seeing that they fall in with the Spirit's design that *all the godly shall, in every age, thus watch;* that faith and hope shall be tested; that the apprehensions of unbelievers shall be quieted; and that the discerning shall observe their due force in the increased energy, etc., manifested through them as the end draws nigh. Hence the propriety of Martensen's (*Ch. Dog.*, s. 279), utterance: "But though believers 'know

neither the day nor the hour;' though it is not for them 'to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put into His own power;' *yet they are commanded to mark the signs of the times; and certain prognostications are given to them.*" [1] It is remarkable that in *the very connection* with the declaration that man cannot know *the exact time* of His Coming (which the experience of the past corroborates), Jesus points believers *to certain signs* as preceding His Coming, saying in Matt. 24 : 32, "*Now learn a parable of the fig-tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh:* SO LIKEWISE YE, *when ye shall see all these things,* KNOW *that it is near, even at the doors;*" and in Luke 21 : 27 the phraseology includes a direct reference to the Coming of the Son of Man with power and great glory, adding: "*And when these things begin to come to pass,* THEN *look up and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh,*" to which the same parable is appended: "Behold the fig-tree and all the trees: When they now shoot forth, *ye see and know of yourselves* that summer is now nigh at hand; *so likewise ye,* when ye see these things come to pass, *know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand*" (Mark 13 : 28, 29 also gives the parable and lesson). These *signs* are to be *cognizant* to every believer, and are observable independent (Olshausen on phrase, "*know of your own selves,*") of another's guidance. After such explicit directions; after an appeal to the reasonableness of so doing; after rebuking (Matt. 16 : 3) the Spirit which refuses to "*discern the signs of the times;*" after implying (which is elsewhere plainly taught) that many would neglect such signs and suffer loss thereby; surely it would argue disrespect to the Saviour, want of attention to our own interests, as well as folly, if we refused *to look at and consider the signs* presented. Aside from the obligation to receive all that God has revealed, aside from the duty of performing His commands, the simple fact that these are graciously communicated not only to sustain the Church in her fighting, struggling condition, not only to prepare her for a season of severe trial, but to enable the believer himself to watch, to exhort others to watchfulness, and to receive the blessings promised to him who thus watches—*this ought to make them exceedingly precious to us.* God, before the introduction of those stupendous events pertaining to the last times, will not leave Himself without *some witness,* which shall reach the hearts of the discerning, and excite a powerful testimony in behalf of an all-pervading Providence ratifying what Omniscience has previously described. Indeed, *love, fervent love,* for an absent Saviour, *a deep longing* for His pleasure-bestowing Presence—*an earnest desire* for perfected salvation, should cause the believer to ponder those signs with *an interest* such as a heart, anxious for deliverance and imbued with the strongest attachment for "the Christ," can possibly prompt.[2]

[1] Martensen gives as signs: signs in nature, preaching of the Gospel, great regeneration in Israel, the climax of Antichrist and general corruption. We commend one sentence of his to the particular notice of the reader. After remarking that "the day of the Lord must ever hover in spiritual nearness before the Church militant" and pointing out how this was exemplified e.g. in the Primitive Church and at the time of the Reformation, he adds: "Is it not a matter of experience which Church history in every part of it confirms, that in those times *when* the Coming of the Lord and the last great day have been looked upon as in infinite distance off, wrapped in the darkness and obscurity of the future, *Christian life also* has borne an indefinite, loose, and careless aspect." So Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com. Luke,* p. 209) remarks: "The recognition of the signs of the times is one of *the most sacred obligations* which our Saviour imposes on all those who

wish to be capable of passing an independent judgment on the concerns of His Kingdom. However the blindness of His contemporaries still shows itself continually under all manner of forms."

[2] Differences of opinion as to the meaning of some signs (i.e. whether literal or figurative, or both) or to the details (i.e. the order in which they are to be observed) should not remove us from the expectancy of *constant* watching. This is to be anticipated in so vast a subject, and arises from the prepossessions, education, amount of study, etc., of interpreters. If it is observable in the plainest of matters, much more will it be in one which is purposely shrouded in language (to induce watchfulness), which a diligent comparison of Scripture can alone explain. Hence it is wrong to advocate any view with bitterness toward others. It is the part of kindness to point out the opinion that we regard erroneous, and to sustain our own by an appeal direct to Scripture, and no one who holds to the supremacy of Scripture will object to this ; but to direct attention to the opinion of others merely to ridicule the same and to call into question the honesty, veracity, etc., of its upholders is unworthy of a student and of a Christian. The writer was forcibly struck with a remark of Edward Bickersteth (as given by Dr. Bell, p. 124, *Proph. Times*, vol. 2): "We ought with humility to go to God's Word together" (he referred to students of prophecy) "and seek to come as near as possible together in a general outline, and then go and proclaim to the Church at large with something of a united testimony that the Lord is at hand. This need not hinder our continued investigation, and our friendly discussion of the various opinions we hold in respect to matters of detail." When Jesus speaks, Matt. 24 : 36, of no man knowing the day and the hour, the student will observe that, while definite time is excluded, two things are implied : (1) a correct knowledge of the event but not of the exact time ; and (2) an approximative knowledge even of time, for "day and hour" are very limited as to time, thus corresponding with the Saviour's appeal to signs in the context. Hence that time—the day and hour—is not definitely known, is again implied by the taking or translation from "the field," "the mill," "the bed ;" for the employment shows that its occurrence was sudden and unexpected, although by signs an approximative knowledge may have been attained.

Obs. 2. The intelligent student of the Bible will be profoundly impressed with this feature of the Word, viz., that as the Old Test. points *to a Coming Messiah*, so also the New Test. directs us *to a Coming Messiah ;* that as the Old Test. prophecies declare that men will *not believe* when the Messiah comes, so the New predicts that men *will not have faith* when the Messiah comes ; that as the brightest prospects of the Old Test. cluster around *a Coming Messiah*, so the most glorious promises are continued in the New related to *a still Coming Christ ;* and that, while Old and New *join* in urging belief in, and looking for, a Coming Saviour, *both* also present *signs* by which that Coming shall be recognized as nigh at hand. Leaving for the present the signs referring to the Sec. Advent, the Old Test. gives as signs pertaining to the First Advent, e.g. an existing Gentile domination, a time of peace, a time of corruption and unbelief which would lead to the Messiah's rejection, etc., including a chronological hint derived from the seventy weeks of Daniel, and a longing of the pious for His Coming. But mark it well, *not one sign* of a startling or Supernatural nature —only signs falling in with *the natural, ordinary development of the times*, and yet, if carefully scrutinized, *sufficiently distinctive* to arrest attention. The startling signs, the Supernatural, *all appeared after the birth of Jesus*, in the interval or space from His actual birth to His ascension, such as the announcement of angels, the star, the descent of the Spirit, the public acknowledgment from heaven, the miracles, etc. *So will it be again.* Men *wonderfully deceive* themselves if they think that the Sec. Advent will be preceded by such signs of astonishing magnitude and Supernatural power, that the attention of the world will be arrested, and that all men will be forced to acknowledge their existence. It is true, that such

signs will appear *before* the final open manifestation of Christ *with* His saints, and that they will occur in *the interval* between His secret Coming *for* His saints and His public Coming *with* them for "vengeance" and "salvation." *Not* distinguishing between the two stages of the Advent, *not* discerning the space of time existing between the two, and *blending* what is separate and distinct into one, has led to the prevailing theorizing on the subject. A little comparison, when attention is once drawn to this point, abundantly confirms our view, as already shown in the Proposition on the Translation (130). Indeed, the parallels given by Jesus Himself, as exactly descriptive of the period immediately before His Advent, would *fail in correspondence*, if the world was to be aroused by antecedent miraculous and astounding signs. The days of Noah and of Lot, as described by Jesus (Luke 17 : 26–30, etc.), are *representative* of the days when the Son of Man comes, but in them are *no signs* which arouse fear and consternation, only a pursuing the ordinary avocations of life with a sense of security, and an ardent attachment to the things of this world. If such signs were to appear and produce the effects upon the world as many contend, it would be difficult to explain the statements, that this Coming is to be "*unawares*," as "*a snare*," as "*a thief*," etc.,[1] seeing that men would, in the very nature of the case, apprehend something important, etc., to occur. The *only signs* vouchsafed in the days of Noah and Lot, were those which sprung from the general corruption of the world, and from the faith of Noah and Lot themselves, running in the channel of *regular, natural development*. There was *nothing Supernatural* until the time had arrived for Noah's and Lot's withdrawal and for God's judgments. Thus, we may rest assured, *it will be again ;* signs will indeed exist, but *in such a form* that the world will not lay them to heart, will "*know not*" until the pent-up floods of God's wrath are ready to overtake them in a deluge of tribulation *utterly unexpected*. The passage which some suppose militates against our view, is easily and satisfactorily explained in consistency with it, viz., Matt. 24 : 29, "*Immediately after the tribulation of those days*," etc., an openly manifested Coming of the Son of Man is designated, and hence it is inferred that the miraculous and startling signs precede the Advent. Correctly, however, they only precede *this* particular, public manifestation of the Advent, and not the Advent considered as *a whole*, i.e. embracing *several stages and a considerable interval* between these. If stress is laid upon the words "immediately *after* the tribulation," this objection proves too much, for the Advent itself is productive of great tribulation ; the expression therefore has undoubted reference to a *particular* tribulation and not to tribulation in general. While it is proper—as we have done in previous Propositions—to employ this phraseology to prove in a general way that the Sec. Advent is not to be confined to the past destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and that it is Pre-Millennial, yet when we come to explain the Advent itself, descending from the general *to the particular*, we have to discriminate *what belongs to this or to that stage of it* (just as we do in the prophecies of the Old Test. respecting His First Advent, in His Coming as a child, in His Coming in the temple, in His Coming riding upon an ass, etc.) ; and this is done by carefully collating the Scripture on the subject. A comparison thus instituted *incontestibly proves* that a certain tribulation is spoken of, viz., the Jewish (beginning with the overthrow of Jerusalem and the scattering of the nation down to the closing of the times of the Gentiles), seeing that the Advent of Jesus, as numerous

plain predictions declare, will bring most terrible tribulation upon the Gentiles confederated together. Now it is a fact, corroborated by Zech. 14, etc., that when the last treading down of the Jews is accomplished by the Antichrist, when their cup of sorrow is completely filled, and when believers, engrafted as Jews, i.e. the seed of Abraham, have passed under the same Antichristian scourge, that *then* Jesus thus comes *with* His saints; and it is to this open Coming *after* the Jews are smitten and the martyrs have been sacrificed by Antichrist, that Jesus reveals Himself to pour tribulation and anguish upon him and his allied hosts, followed by a gathering of His elect people the (Jewish nation as the prophets all predict —His own special inheritance), thus previously smitten, from all parts of the earth. This Coming is distinguished by remarkable signs which take place between its occurrence and the concealed (from the world) stage of the Advent. And in view of this prediction being specially given in reference to the Jewish nation, its downfall and continuance under Gentile domination for a long period, it was eminently proper for Jesus to designate *that particular stage* of His Coming, which is to be exhibited in a marked manner *in its behalf* when the final blow has befallen it. The perfect accuracy of prediction, in its agreement, one with another, is thus vindicated; no conflict arises either in the prescribed order of events, or in the stated condition of the world preceding the Advent, or in the prophecies pertaining to the manner of the Advent. (Comp. remarks on Advent, Prop. 130.)[2] Therefore it is, that, departing from the usual course pursued, *we divide the signs relating to the Advent into two classes; one* pertaining to those which precede the entire Advent or the first stage of it; and *the other* relating to the last stage of the Advent or embracing the signs in the interval between the two stages; the *one* stage occurring when even the righteous "*think not*," being suddenly "*in that night;*" and the other taking place *when* the righteous *know* that it must and will happen.[3]

[1] Sir Th. Browne (*Religio Medici*, S. 46) long ago shrewdly remarked; "'There shall be signs in the moon and stars;' how comes He then like a thief in the night, when He gives an item of His Coming?" Comp. Prop. 130 and related ones. The Advent coming as "a snare" and "a net," unbelief need not look for startling, miraculous signs; this would defeat the predictions. Lange (*Com.* Matt. 24 : 38) makes an important statement well expressed: "The chronological end of the world *is concealed by its seeming prosperity* in the last days as in the days of the flood." The Saviour in Matt. 24 did not give the time when these things should be, but He encouraged the inquiry respecting it by graciously presenting certain signs to indicate their nearness. Thus in reference to Jerusalem He did not give the exact time of its destruction, but *specific signs* by which believers —accepting of them—saved themselves from its ruin. So precisely is it with reference to the Sec. Advent—the signs are given and we must—if desirous to secure divine protection—avail ourselves of them.

[2] The only other passage that has been adduced to the contrary, viz., 2 Thess. 2 : 8, we have already considered under Prop. 130 on Translation. This has also reference to *the open* manifestation of Christ which precedes "the day of the Lord Jesus"—a day however also preceded by the tribulation under the Antichrist and by the removal of some who shall not endure it. Hence the Thess. brethren are assured that they are not in darkness, that that day shall not come to them as a thief, etc:, because if faithful they shall be raised up—being children of the day—to witness its incoming. The arguments of the Apostle, to allay their fears that the day of the Lord had already come, and they were not escaped, etc., is directed *not so much* to the Advent as to the day itself, and implies, upon the face of it, that owing to this incoming apostasy and the final revelation of the man of sin, not only that the Advent had not taken place, not only that the day of the Lord had not come, but distinctively refers to the latter as not coming until Antichrist is revealed and destroyed by the open manifestation of Jesus; and therefore the removal of the Thessalonian brethren before the last event is a matter taken for

granted, the promise being in the first Epistle. There is a delicacy most remarkable in Paul in not directly telling them *how* their escape should be brought to pass, leaving to them the bright prospect and continued hope that Jesus would protect them.

[3] The reader will see from this and the statements under Prop. 130, etc., how utterly unreasonable has been the conduct of those who, like the Millerites and Sec. Adventists (differing widely from us on essential Millenarian points still held to a speedy Sec. Advent), professed to fix the exact day and hour of Christ's Coming and assembled together, in ascension robes, to witness the Advent, totally overlooking the fact that the first stage of the Advent is the Coming like a thief, and not the open manifestation they anticipated. Without questioning the sincerity or piety of the parties, it evinces a lack of comparison of Scripture and of prudence, being eminently calculated to bring discredit and ridicule upon the hope of the Advent. Strange that this should be so often repeated, as e.g. recently a band of Sec. Adventists of Lewiston, Maine, under Elder Thurman, spent the evening of Good Friday, 1876, in watching until midnight. But stranger still, that men who believe in the Bible, its teachings and warnings respecting the Sec. Advent, should be influenced by such fanaticism to cast aside the whole subject as unworthy of serious consideration, just as if the misdirected zeal and enthusiasm of others could cancel the declarations of Scripture. For while it is true that Jesus said, "Ye know not when" the time is; "what I say unto you I say unto all, watch" (see Mark 13 : 35-37), yet the very injunction of watching includes the idea of our ability to attain approximative knowledge—a sufficiency—so that, as Jesus also said, that day shall not come upon us unawares. Three extremes are to be avoided: (1) to fix definite, positive time; (2) to ignore the signs; (3) and to encourage any interpretation or application that forbids or hinders a daily posture of watching.

Obs. 3. The *signs* preceding the first stage of the Advent are all of such a nature, that they appear, more or less, *in every generation;* and hence in view of their *continued* existence, have caused men in the various succeeding centuries to hold (as e.g. Gregory the Great, Luther, and many others), that the end was very near, because *the signs indicative of the same* were really present.[1] These men too were *not mistaken*—as misapprehending and faultfinding unbelief would have it—in the signs; many of them were indeed painfully present, and it is to *the honor and piety* of these believers in the Word that *they recognized* them, and assumed the posture of servants looking for the Coming of the Master. Having already alluded to the practical reason for presenting signs, thus testifying before every succeeding generation, it may be added: that it is reasonable to suppose that such will assume a *greater magnitude* as the time of the end draws nigh, or, at least, that they appear in *such proportions* that the believing (for whom *alone* they are intended) cannot mistake in their *presence and import.* The *signs* to which the Spirit calls our attention are the following:

1. The world will be in a comparative state of *peace and prosperity;* at least to a degree that it fondly hopes for "*peace and safety,*" so that at the Coming of Jesus for His sleeping and living saints the usual routine of the world shall be going on, men claiming that (2 Pet. 3 : 4) "*all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.*" Men's thoughts and affections will be fixed on the things of the world, unapprehensive of the evil nigh at hand. Jesus gives a vivid picture of the time when he says (Luke 17 : 26–30), that men shall be engaged in "eating, drinking, marrying, and giving in marriage, buying, selling, planting, and building"—a representation not only of *fancied security,* but of a period of *trust and confidence* in the stability and perpetuity of *a then existing* state of things. Now while this has been the actual condition of the world, more or less, since the first century, is it not true that this feeling, this confidence in *the endurance of the present ordering of nature* is at the present time greatly intensified? *When* intelligent, scientific men send forth a multi-

tude of books, *when* leading periodicals and journals go forth among the masses, all teaching with a bold exaggeration the past and the future stability of things under the garb of "the unalterable laws of nature," etc., it does not require any answer. No age before this has ever exhibited such extraordinary activity in producing a Noahic condition of man in this direction. And so much are the minds and the affections of the people taken up with the world, that not only are the things mentioned by Jesus made the special subjects of books, tracts, periodicals, organizations, etc., but they are the engrossing subjects of life for the immense majority. So patent is this, that it needs no additional remark; for thoughtful men, of all classes, have sufficiently commented on this feature. Things in themselves not sinful become such when allowed *to reign supremely* over the heart of man, and the trust, which God justly demands, is placed in them.[2]

2. The existence of *widespread unbelief* in the warnings and words of God were characteristic of the days of Noah,[3] and Jesus informs us that it will be equally so at the time of His Coming, for "*when the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?*" (Luke 18 : 8). While unbelief has been evermore largely found in every age, yet it is *more intensive and commanding now* than ever before, resulting not merely in the vast numbers thus given to unbelief but in the sad fact that multitudes of the leaders of society, scholars, statesmen, lecturers, etc. (see Props. 177 and 180), are moulding society into such a Noahic condition. Unbelief has its able and earnest advocates by the thousand, and counts its hosts by the million : it has, amid its varied forms, enlisted into its service vigorous intellects aided by a powerful press, who are pushing on the assault against the Bible and Christianity with a boldness and a success (because acceptable to human nature), that is astonishing. One hundred years ago it would scarcely have been credited, if any one had foretold what we see to-day, so swift and abounding has been the inroad of an unbelief which Antediluvian-like ridicules the idea of believing in God's commandments and threats, and even dares to call into question His divine character and existence. The substitution of nature, or law, or humanity, or science, etc., in the place of the God of the Bible, is only too favorable in producing the predicted result and sign.[4]

3. This unbelief, however, leads to the rising up of "*scoffers*" and to a direct denial of a certain truth. Peter after exhorting us to "be mindful of the words spoken" (2 Pet. 3 : 3, 4), adds : "*Knowing this first*" ("as one of the predictions which demand your special regard"—so Barnes *loci*) "*that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying : Where is the promise of His Coming?*" Noah warned the people of coming wrath against ungodliness, so now the Word warns the world of coming judgments at the Advent of the Son of Man, but men perversely *ridicule both*. However true this has been in the past, *to-day* it is specially manifested. Books and papers are abundantly circulated, which regard the Deluge as "a huge joke," and scoff and sneer at a Coming Saviour as "an idle dream," fit only for weak, superstitious minds. Men in the highest ranks of intelligence and society *lend themselves* to this scoffing, and broadly record it in the current literature. The very plea, too, which Peter foretells, is now employed by them, viz., that the prophets were mistaken; that the proof of their mistake lies in the fact that the world has existed *ever so long* without their predictions being realized, so that, judging from the past, *the uniformity of law* forbids such Supernatural interference, and that those who confidently looked for those things were

miserably deceived, etc. The general reader needs not to be told *how extensively* such views are circulated and embraced, and *how offensively, scoffingly*, they are uttered among the high and the low of the earth. And, *the manner* in which this objection is uttered, *the spirit* in which it is urged, also shows what Peter declares, viz., that they "*are willingly ignorant*," i.e., that they *desire* to hold such an opinion, that it *suits* their pleasure or will to be thus ignorant. How this is exhibited at present *in hatred* to the Bible, in *a wilful* procedure to undermine its authority, etc., is only too evident.[5]

4. This injunction of Peter's to notice "*first*," as important evidence, how scoffers will arise and deny the Lord's Coming, implies not only that such an Advent is "*the blessed hope*," but that it is *largely dwelt upon, prominently brought to public notice and represented as near*, when the end approaches. Good and great men in the past centuries have thus held up the Coming of Jesus; and it is a most significant truth that Eschatology has *never been* so intently studied;[6] that the nearness of Christ's Coming has *never been* so widely and presistently proclaimed; that the cry: "Behold the Bridegroom Cometh," has *never been* so loudly sounded in the ears of the Church and the world; that the warnings of prophets, apostles, and Jesus, to be constantly on the watch have *never been* so urgently pressed upon the attention of others, *as within the last few years.* While the number of advocates, compared with the multitude of unbelievers, are comparatively few yet they can be counted by the hundred and thousand; they can be found in all our leading churches, and have among them many who are noted for learning, ability, piety and usefulness.[7] Periodicals specially devoted to the subject, books and tracts in various languages enforcing the same, are scattered over the earth, so that the sign becomes exceedingly significant.[8]

5. But the most saddening sign is that this questioning and unbelief respecting the reality and nearness of the Coming of Jesus is not confined to the world but is to be found *in the Church*, among professing believers. The urgency and frequency with which Christ points out that those who declare themselves to be servants *shall neglect to watch* for His Coming and shall suffer loss—the repeated exhortations to watchfulness implying *the neglect of it in the Church*, and the startling question (Luke 18 : 8) respecting faith in His Coming from which our best critics and commentators have inferred, rightfully that there will be but *little*—all this finds *its mate* in the Church of to-day. Large bodies of professing Christians (e.g. Swedenborgians, Unitarians and others) have *spiritualized the Advent away;* ministers in high standing (as e.g. recently Desprez in *John or the Apoc.*) recommend the ruling out, as unreliable and false, of *everything relating to this Second Advent;*[9] Christian authors of celebrity (as e.g. Prof. Stuart, Dr. Brown, etc.) insist upon it that the Millenarian doctrine of the speedy Coming of Christ is *to be rejected* as folly, etc.; while thousands of others, leaders too, either entirely *ignore* it, or *reproachfully* allude to it as "fanatical" etc. It is but too true, that now men *substitute* death, or providence, or Jerusalem, or spiritual gifts, or something else, in the place of the Advent; and that as Mather aptly expressed it, "*the sleeping medicine*" is profusely administered and gladly received. The Advent is placed so remotely in the distance, or is so indefinitely regarded, that its practical influence (comp. Olshausen *Com.*, vol. 2, p. 260) is lost. Even "*the wise virgins*" are affected thereby until the cry arouses them betimes.[10]

6. The Church shall be *under trial.* At no period in her history down to the Advent, shall she be entirely freed from the testing and suffering prescribed for her, as can be seen in the epitome of events from the First Advent down to the Sec. Advent given in Matt. 24; Mark 13; Luke 21; 2 Thess. 2, and in the positive assertions of the Spirit that the world shall always hate, etc., the godly. This has always been true in the past; even in the most prosperous external condition of the Church has she been compelled to fight against her enemies from within and without. *This is true to-day:* her enemies are numerous, they assault her from all sides, and however outwardly prosperous in some countries, in others her condition is feeble, and she finds herself overwhelmingly oppressed. The saddening reports of delegates at the last Evang. Alliance at New York tell, in part, the sorrowful story. We have only to look at the once favored Germany, at Austria, Spain, etc., and the truth of God's Word is apparent. And yet there are intimations in the Word, that men shall overlook the imposed condition of trial, and shall prophesy "peace and safety," increased prosperity, and extended influence, etc., just as we now see the most eminent men, over against the most explicit declarations to the contrary, predict a most glorious future, world wide to the Church in its present ordering. These things thus conjoined, and practically witnessed, make careful students the more confirmed in the wisdom of constant watchfulness.[11]

7. The Church under trial shall (like the Primitive Church, etc.) continue to proclaim the Gospel until it forms "*a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come,*" Matt. 24 : 14. (Not to convert the nations but to be *a testimony* to them, see Prop. 175, and also consider how the word "all" "in all the world" etc. may, according to Scripture usage, denote a large portion, etc., of it.) We have here a very extensive, general proclamation of the Gospel predicted, but nothing said that the testimony *will be received;* indeed we do know that while the Gospel *saves* them that believe, it also *condemns* those who reject it. Here, however, the preaching of it widespread among the nations over the earth, is given as *a sign* of the approaching end of this age or dispensation. This sign has always, more or less, existed even in the apostle's day (Col. 1 : 6, 23, etc.), but *never* as it presents itself to-day. The astonishing missionary labors over the globe, the Bible and Tract Societies with their astounding publications scattered over the earth, the remarkable revivals of religion (such were at Jerusalem before its destruction) in various countries, the union of prayer and effort, the Sunday-school interest, the Christian Alliances bringing into fraternal converse brethren of all climes, the extended work of the various individual denominations through their several Boards, Institutions, etc.—these are things *so pertinent in fulfilment* that they bring out this sign to the observant with great and thrilling distinctness. Melville, Newton, and a host of able writers, have aptly said: "that the Gospel preached for a witness, conveys the idea *of rejection* rather than *of acceptance,*" and this is abundantly corroborated by other Scripture, making it true down to the end itself that "*many are called but few chosen.*" This then is a sign, not as many take it, of the conversion of the nations, but of the approaching end, just as the entire early Church, instructed by the inspired preachers of this same Gospel, held and taught. Jesus expresses this sign in the most general terms, so that as the amount of witnessing to each nation or to all of them combined

is not stated definitely, it may, for aught we know to the contrary, close almost any day. The leading nations of the earth have long had this witness, and it has been borne to almost every tribe upon the face of the earth, how much more before the Sec. Advent is yet to be done God *alone* knows.[12]

8. While the Gospel is preached as a witness, while the devotion of those who love Jesus leads to advocacy of the truth, another sign is *the condition* of the Church itself. It is not merely the continued mixture of the tares with the wheat but a fearful *preponderating* of the tares over the wheat. Outward prosperity, the building of massive churches, the increase of riches, the influx of numbers, etc., is *no criterion* of piety as the Word and the history of the past shows. The Laodicean state has been too often repeated (which has often led good men to think that the end was near) to mislead us. Now, aside from the Scripture which teaches us that the Gentiles shall become "*high-minded;*" that there will be *a woful lack* of faith; that "*many,*" who prophecy, etc., in His name shall be rejected; that the Church as a body, shall be *unprepared* for His Coming, it is sufficient to direct the reader to the simple fact, that something of the kind must necessarily precede the end, *because the Church must endure the last great tribulation under the Antichrist.* If worthy and pure, she would *escape* it, but in view of her *moral condition* she is to pass through its purifying fires. Seeing then what is before her, as the end draws nigh we ought to behold in her *that evil* which will bring the heavy predicted infliction upon her. Alas! looking around and contrasting the Church with the positive requirements of the Word, what do we behold? Admitting the piety and fervent love and labor existing in all denominations (for if it were not for this, the time would be shortened in judgment), yet do not godly men in all Churches deplore the existing divisions—bigotry—intolerance—mere nominal profession—undue elevation of the Sacraments—exaltation of creed above the Bible—substitution of tradition for Revelation—yielding up of inspiration and truth to science—faith exchanged for reason—ignoring of vital doctrines and practical truths—the lowering of the Supernatural to a more natural basis—neglect of prayer and worship—the feasting, etc., to procure Church and benevolent funds—aping after fashion, extravagance of dress, and exhibition of pride—fashionable music and accommodating preaching—the spirit of covetousness, together with the ostentation and parade in giving—the ostentatious eulogy of past benevolence—greater attachment and love for measures and reforms outside of the Church—the puffing of institutions, men, books, and sermons beyond truth—the non-confessing of Christ during the week—the advance of infidelity among the ministry and laity—sensational preachers—the use of scriptural terms while the reality is denied—the debasement of duty to policy—the direct Romanizing tendencies—the fanaticism and sectarianism on the one part and a broad tolerance upon the other—the coldness, even deadness manifested—the study of human systems, etc., to the neglect of the Bible—the softening and toning down of God's rebukes—the lack of family religion—the straining at a gnat and swallowing of a camel—the trust in self-righteousness—the confidence in man's ability and regenerating power of humanity—the seeking after earthly things to the neglect of the spiritual—the returning evil for evil—the envy, contention, want of charity, slandering, etc., too often manifested—the intemperance, impatience, murmuring arro-

gance, flattery, boasting, etc., exhibited—the form of godliness, but denying the power—the merely sentimental, poetical, philosophical, scientific preaching—the spirit so prevalent to entertain or amuse the people by the introduction of novelties, etc.—in brief, through the whole category of things forbidden by the Word. It is eminently true to-day, that while "*many*" profess and loudly too, the real followers of Christ are "*few.*" Hence judgment may come at any time.[13]

9. But this is not all: while the immense majority of the professing Church is only *nominally* Christian, and given to mere *formalism* (often propagated with mistaken zeal), it is a significant sign of the present day, that overlooking the real condition of things and mistaking the mission of the Church, so many of its representative men looking only at the riches and increase in goods, at the professing numbers, etc., stand up and, imitating the example of others in the days of Constantine, *predict continued and ever growing prosperity.* Blinded by the magnificent and numerous churches, by the revivals of religion, by the vast operations of the institutions, etc., they prophesy, *not* of coming tribulation, *not* of a nearness to the end, *not* of God's coming controversy with the nations of the earth, *but* of peace and triumph through existing instrumentalities. The Jubilee Hymns, thousands of books, periodicals, etc., are full of it; we hear it in singing, prayer and preaching all over the earth. Now if the Advent is really as predicted, to come upon the Church *unawares, unexpectedly,* when both "wise and foolish virgins" are asleep, reason teaches us that *preliminary* to such a Coming and condition of the Church, *there must be a course of teaching, a popular representation of doctrine to bring the Church into so false and dangerous a position.* And well, too, may we suppose this cannot and will not be accomplished unless, men of *eminent* ability and devotion—*acknowledged leaders*—perform this saddening work of influencing the minds of the masses. The student, whose faith is *in* God's predictions, accepts this as *a sign* remarkable in this age.[14]

10. There is another sign attached to the Church, the worst of all, and the most significant, viz., *the fearful apostasy* witnessed in her.[15] The reason why Paul so guardedly expresses himself, e.g. 2 Thess. 2, concerning the falling away and the rise of Antichrist is, that *in every generation* such apostatizing and (as John says even existed in his day) Antichristian powers should be witnessed, so that the believing might be influenced to occupy the position of watchfulness. We see how it did this in the past, and surely it ought, in view of what we behold, have the same, and *even greater,* tendency to-day. See how vast, the most powerful organizations have fallen away from truth; how bodies counting their millions of adherents are in direct opposition to Bible doctrine and primitive belief; how hundreds of smaller sects, communities, etc., in the aggregate swelling to a great multitude, deny the most fundamental truths, dishonor the Christ by their views and practices, and elevate their own human derived revelations, etc., above the Scriptures. Bad and extended as the apostasy was in the past, yet it is *a fact, undeniable that so far as mere numbers or the variety of form* is concerned, that to-day *more of mankind* are enthralled at one time in the meshes of apostasy than ever before. Behold the Papacy (crippled indeed in her temporal power but as vigorous as ever in apostatizing as witnessed recently in the promulgation of the immaculate conception, infallibility of the Pope, etc.), the Greek Church (in its exaltation of

sacraments, etc.) the Mormons, and, in brief, a large number out of the hundreds of conflicting systems of belief now extant in the world, and is it not true that while old forms of heresy and antagonism *are retained* and *revived, new forms* have sprung up in all directions. Seeing this state among the *professing* people of God, a state to which infidelity (not recognizing how God's spirit has *predicted* it as a result of human nature) sneeringly points as indicative of the unreality of Christianity, a state in which is fearfully realized Paul's (2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4) prediction : "*For the time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables.*" Alas ! how true in the past, and how true at the present time. The thoughtful may well ponder it, when witnessing the wonderful activity of all connected therewith. Such a condition, however painful, is a prerequisite to the development of the culminated Antichrist.[16]

11. Another sign is the continued conversion of some. No matter how great the apostasy, how mighty the defection, yet as *the design* of this dispensation is to gather out them that believe, to call and save some in order to form a chosen body in the Theocratic ordering, there always must, and will be, *a true and faithful people* of God ; not indeed, as some foolishly and arrogantly claim, all belonging to this or that body of professing believers, but found in the various denominations, God-obeying and fearing men and women who have heartily embraced the Saviour provided for them. The preached Word now, as ever, will find its different classes of hearers, but among them is one, *the minority* it may be, which receives the truth in *honest* hearts and develops the *fruits* of righteousness pertaining to it. This has always been so, even in the darkest period, but it is *eminently* the case now. While the tares are numerous, tall and great, there is *more* wheat to-day in the field than *ever before at one time.* In all countries it is growing, ready to fill the garner. This encourages us to believe that the end is near, for it shows the *present success* in gathering out that elect number who are to inherit the Kingdom, and that the number is being *rapidly* completed. The recent successful labors of ministers and laymen are encouraging amid the widespread lukewarmness, coldness, deadness and apostasy of the Church, and *like* the remarkable success of apostolic preaching in Jerusalem, may be the immediate forerunners of the speedy Coming end. God is graciously and mercifully working, not willing that any should perish, but such grace and mercy must not be received as indicative of *the non-fulfilment* of His own predictions. The past dealings of God show, that just before the infliction of righteous judgment He has been most kind and condescending, and thus it may be again.[17]

12. Another sign is *the present recovering strength* of the Papacy. Men, in view of the loss of her temporal dominions have predicted her continued diminution of power among the nations, but this down to the concealed or first stage of the Advent cannot and will not take place. The mistake has arisen from confounding the culminated Antichrist with the Papacy, a mistake that is now generally avoided by prophetical writers (see Prop. 161, etc.). It is distinctly predicted that the Papacy (the only body existing that fully meets in every particular the prophetical description) shall exist down *beyond* the gathering of the 144,000 (Rev. 14 : 8), and shall come to an end *before* (Rev. 17 : 16) the battle of the great day (Rev.

19 : 19, 20, for the "false prophet" is thus unmistakably shown to be different from the Papacy). It is *yet* to play an important part, and to experience *a terrible ordeal* from the nations whom it has seduced, even *after* the resurrection and translation of a chosen body. Hence it is reasonable not to look for its destruction, but rather for *increased vigor and renewed claims.* These are accordingly found in it, for notwithstanding the blows it has received, it is yet *the most powerful* in numbers, and its influence is *widening* in England, America and other countries. Its recent dogmas give it a certain maturity that in this age is significant ; its ancient spirit is revived and is manifested in extraordinary missionary efforts and a propagandism that is successful in gaining converts among the influential and powerful, as well as among the weak and lowly. Anticipating her doom as delineated in prophecy, her present struggles to regain a supremacy over the nations of the earth, are of deep interest, inasmuch as they indicate precisely that state of affairs which, by the revival of Hildebrandic claims, etc., will inevitably bring upon her that *hatred* of nations resulting in her *final and total ruin.* Therefore the position and assumptions of the Papacy are way-marks of *nearness* that the thoughtful will do well to consider. She invites the storm, and it will come in due time with overwhelming fury.[18]

13. "*The confidence in the flesh,*" or the schemes for the regeneration of Society through the development of Humanity, is *a noted sign* of the present day. While the spirit has always, more or less, existed, it is only more recently that it has been wonderfully developed. Socialism, Communism, Harmonial Philosophy, Pantheism, Rationalism, Politics, etc., are all endeavoring to show how the world is to be reformed. It is not simply unbelief in the Word that exists, but *such confidence* in the ability of man to elevate himself to the highest state of perfection, that multitudes of the intelligent and able are suggesting and advocating plans for the amelioration and exaltation of the race, independent of, and esteemed far better than, God's plan. Some present an Eclectic scheme which even praises Christ as a model of humanity while denying His being a Redeemer ; others cut loose from the Bible entirely and give us new plans of "Reform," "Rights," "Liberty," etc. All agree in denying what God says respecting humanity, and the necessity of having a Mediator and Redeemer. Its advocates are to be counted by the thousand, and embrace leading writers of all classes, from those who endeavor to make their views as *little offensive* as possible to Christian belief to those who are *most outrageous blasphemers.* Now let the reader consider the state of the world as predicted immediately before the end ; the world arrayed in hostility to Christ and His Word, confederated against Him, and surely if we are drawing near to that period, it is reasonable to see the elements already working *preliminary* to such a result. Hence, this condition is the very one that ought to be anticipated, viz. that men under the plausible pleas of perfectibility, etc., should be led astray.[19]

14. The most insidious forms and elements are used, to lead to *a practical unbelief* of the Word, and to induce a spirit of *worldliness.* Thus e.g. the cry of toleration raised in many quarters. While intolerance is manifested in some directions in sects and in the world (and infidelity rejoices in holding up the intolerance of the old Genevan, Scottish and Puritan state, without any effort at considering the motives and the age), yet, so far as the Church is concerned, the leaven of toleration, as now advocated

by leading minds, is far *more* dangerous. Cheerfully admitting the unity of believers in Christ, and the fraternal feeling and association that should characterize such, our remarks are not intended for that toleration of others who hold to the fundamental truths pertaining to Christ, and who in faith receive Him as the Saviour; and we exclude not the allowing to others the liberty of worshipping God according to the dictates of conscience and knowledge possessed. They apply to that looseness of doctrinal position, which pretends to make *life all and doctrine nothing;* which is willing to receive into fraternal union and cordial sympathy those who deny *the necessity* of repentance and faith, of having a sacrifice for sin, of having a divine-human Saviour, etc. It is painfully evident that many truths clearly taught in the Bible, and always esteemed *as fundamental* in forming a Christian, are now discarded by ministers and laymen. A "Broad Church" embracing the reception of, and affiliation with, virtual unbelievers, denying or explaining away inspiration, rejecting long portions of the Word as impracticable at this day, exaggerating the knowledge of the present day over that of inspired men, etc., is advocated *by large numbers of scholarly men.* A "blood bought" Church, is to them a superstition of the past; an humble trust and reliance upon all Scripture as given by holy men, is to them evidence of folly; the limiting of the capabilities of human nature, making a direct divine interference necessary in Salvation is to them an exploded theory; and thus, through a large category. They pride themselves in *a man-devised* Reformation with a sufficient interpolation of Scripture and religious phraseology to give it a Christian coloring, and to conceal the false views of man and of the Gospel entertained, and often eloquently expressed. This fraternizing with and acknowledging of those as *brethren in Christ* who deny the claims of Christ, not only paves the way for the condition of unbelief at the Advent but prepares many for the spirit of antagonism and intolerance which is to be fearfully exhibited.[20]

15. Thoughtful men too will ponder a remarkable feature presented in our day, viz. *the earnest desire for union upon a truly scriptural basis.* The impending struggle with unbelief, the diversity and dangers existing within and without the Church, the threatening aspect of multitudes, has led pious and devoted men of various creeds to long for, and inaugurate, measures which should bring true believers, throughout the world, into closer connection and fraternal interchange. The General Alliances as well as the more particular, indicate this feeling and the extent to which it is carried. So also the Week of Prayer in which so many participate. In view of what is in store for the Church, viz. *the terrible persecution* so clearly predicted, and which must infallibly come, it is significant that godly men—no matter how they are regarded by intolerant brethren confessionally or sacramentally bound—everywhere feel the importance and necessity of movements in this very direction. Indeed, it is precisely what we ought to anticipate, being *preliminary* to the encouragement that the Church will need and the work she will have to perform when *the hour of trial* shall come. 1 Cor. 13 is fulfilling on a scale *never before* witnessed.[21]

16. The existence of widespread corruption, just as it was in the days of Noah, is characteristic of the period preceding the Advent. Such corruption has, more or less, continuously existed, and at certain intervals, when specially manifested, has called forth, from the godly, belief in a speedy

Advent. But it is to be noticed that such wickedness is always *proportionate* to the amount of light enjoyed, and if the advantages, privileges, testimony, etc., of the present day are regarded, the wickedness is *far greater* than at any other time, being *the more inexcusable.* Consider the crime annually committed ; the awful statistics of our towns and cities ; the arson, robbery, adultery, fornication, rape, prostitution, divorce, free-loveism, swindling, fraud, strikes, profanity, drunkenness, violence, murder, assassinations, etc., reported by our newspapers (and which really is but a small portion of what is actually done), and all this committed where the Gospel is accessible, and who can estimate *the enormity* of such sinfulness. So great and widely spread is it too, that many even of the secular press direct attention to it as something deplorable, indicating a state of morals which must, if not in some way checked, lead to disastrous consequences. Can we take up a newspaper without seeing evidence of such a state? Admitting the good, at the side of it stands an immense amount of evil. And this is only *introductory* to that which is yet to come. If the sinfulness of the world, of our cities and towns were steadily diminishing ; if the statistics of crime would indicate a constantly lessening number ; the sign would fail, but as the end is approaching when an overwhelming flood of evil springing out of corrupt human nature is to be experienced, the evidence of such corruption, if we are near, in its *preliminary forms* must be existing. That they do so, no believer in the denunciations of sinfulness by God can possibly deny. Hence we hold them, as the Spirit has taught us, *a sign* of approaching judgments.[22]

17. But this is not all, for while the Saviour has in general terms directed us to the days of Noah and Lot, the Spirit has more particularly described the time preceding the Advent, and we have only to compare such predictions with the present to satisfy ourselves that they are *painfully manifested.* Thus e.g. 1 Tim. 4 : 1–4, "*Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils ; speaking lies in hypocrisy ; having their conscience seared with a hot iron ; forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats,*" etc. However applicable this may be to Socialistic and other theories ; however prevalent in some of its features here and there, yet more recently a system has arisen, which in view of the number and respectability of its defenders is a significant fulfilment of the prediction. While Spiritualism has existed in some of its forms before (even table-rapping, etc., practised by the Jews, p. 369 Delitzsch's *Sys. of Bib. Psyc.*),[23] yet it is only recently that extensive works, numerous writings, etc. have perfected it into a sort of religious system, claiming a large host of adherents. However much the Papacy, etc., has invoked the aid of demons (i.e. the souls of men who have died, in prayer, or of Mary as a kind of goddess, or of supposed divine agents), this is *pre-eminently* characteristic of Spiritualism—its *leading, fundamental* doctrine. "*Doctrines of Devils,*" or rather "*of demons,*" has been by the best of interpreters and by numerous critics, in view of the meaning of the original, applied, and justly, to doctrines respecting or derived professedly from the souls of departed ones. The word "demons" translated "devils" may denote "a god or goddess, or a divine being, or the souls of deceased persons, forming tutelary divinities, geniuses, or teachers, and lastly a demon in the Jewish sense, a bad spirit subject to Satan"—so Barnes *Com. loci*, and many others.[24] The fulfilment determines what meaning is to be applied, and this we find

in the system now arising, viz., *the teaching of doctrines pertaining to, and professedly derived from, the souls of deceased persons.* A system *so exclusively* based upon this feature is certainly *a sign* that ought to arrest attention. Departing from the faith as laid down ; giving heed to seducing spirits ; such doctrines are received *in place* of divine Revelation. The briefest summary of some of these doctrines will sufficiently illustrate the anti-Christian nature of it. It claims to be a "New Dispensation" (Judge Edmonds) ; a "new way of religious Light" (Hare) ; its authority to be superior to that of the Bible (Harris) ; which teaches that there is no Divinity in Christ (excepting as belongs to all men in common), and that He was only a medium (Harris) ; that there is no atonement in Him and no salvation by faith (Harris) ; that there is no resurrection of the dead and no eternal judgment (Owen) ; that sin is an impossibility and rightly considered vice is virtue.[25] It is taught by some that "nature is God" and that "all things originate in nature" (Harris) ; that all men irrespective of character will be saved (Harris) ; that we can even pray to the devil (so Miss Doten, *Banner of Light*, Dec. 21, 1861, and March 1, 1862, etc.) ; and that marriage as now constituted and enjoined is a curse and should be abrogated for "spiritual affinities" (Spear, *Banner of Light, Spi. Telegraph*, etc). The sickening list could well be extended as held by extremists, and more or less connived at by the moderates,[26] but this will suffice to show *how accurately* God's Holy Word is fulfilling before our eyes, and in things too which are said to be given as "*expressly*" illustrative of "*the last times.*" But in connection with these things, so many others are added adapted to the longings and spiritual cravings of man, that a large number influenced by the boasted "life and immortality brought to light" by it, accept of the system without seeing or appreciating *the depths of iniquity.* Now the careful student of the Word, who sees it clearly predicted, that, as the time of the end draws nigh, there must be a powerful spirit of "*man-worship*" gradually introduced to pave the way for the great Antichrist, looks around, as an evidence of the approaching end, for this spirit. He beholds it, alas, *fearfully predominant* not only in Rationalism, Socialism, etc., but again lifted up in this *widespread delusion* extending to the pulpit and the pew, to all classes and professions, and so fascinating in its appeals to the heart, that men of intelligence and high position become its *willing* converts and defenders.[27]

18. The Spirit widens the evidence or signs by giving us a cluster of them in 2 Tim. 3 : 1–9 : "*This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come,*" etc. Now while the characters following have always more or less, existed, it is also true—as needs be for a sign—that they are abundantly manifested to-day. Let us briefly survey them. (a) "*For men shall be lovers of their own selves*"—*selfishness* is eminently characteristic of these times, so much so that it needs no corroboration. (b) "*Covetous ;*" *the love of money* is another marked feature of the age, evidencing itself in a thousand ways. (c) "*Boasters ;*" how much this is exhibited in the arrogation of things, in inordinate self-conceit, etc., we leave the reader to judge. (d) "*Proud ;*" unreasonable *self-esteem*, an overweaning conceit of supposed superiority in wealth, position, talents, beauty, dress, accomplishments, station, knowledge, etc., is so abundant on all sides that it needs no proof. (e) "*Inventors of evil things ;*" behold the various devices to gratify passion without discovery, the introduction of new forms of luxury, new modes of gratification, new arts and plans to practice evil, etc.

Some things are of so dark a nature that a hint alone must suffice. In the moral, religious, social, physical, such things exist, and to so great an extent that statesmen and eminent jurists have directed attention to it as exceedingly lamentable. (f) "*Disobedient to parents;*" how largely this is indicative of the age has been *the complaint* of many writers, witnessed as it is in a disregard to home influence, and congregating in places of public resort, in idleness, wilfulness, vanity, want of honor in speech and attention, etc., that it has become common to speak of "young America," "fast young men and women," etc. The saloons, numerous public entertainments, etc., foster this spirit. (g) "*Unthankful,*" i.e., manifesting ingratitude—how this is made apparent, needs no commentary, *both* toward God and man. (h) "*Unholy,*" i.e., are regardless of duty to God and man, possess no piety and are irreligious. The multitudes in this sad condition and boasting even of it, is *the mate* to the prediction. (i) "*Without natural affection,*" i.e., a want of regard for children. It is, aside from other considerations, amply sufficient that the most eminent medical men have pointed out as a crying sin of this and other nations *the child-murder* in the womb and the preventives (so boldly advertised and circulated in books) employed. Statistics of decrease in some localities perfectly startling are presented. (j) "*Truce breakers,*" i.e., those who violate compacts or agreements. A disregard of one's word, an aversion to be held by a given compact, a violation of trust, is undoubtedly a characteristic of the age as evidenced in the frequent failures of trust, the swindling operations, etc. (k) "*False accusers;*" that is, those who are (marg. read.) "*makebates,*" given to exciting contention and quarrels. Society suffers greatly, in all its relations, from this class. (l) "*Incontinent,*" i.e., without strength to resist the solicitations of passion. How mightily this is evidenced in intemperance, sensuality, places of assignation, etc., is self-evident. (m) "*Fierce;*" i.e., harsh, severe toward others. The lack of gentleness, mildness, meekness, and the exhibition of harshness and cruelty is so general, that scarcely a newspaper can be read without containing its illustrations of the fact. (m) "*Despisers of those who are good;*" how largely this is characteristic of the times is loudly proclaimed in the multitude of books and papers which speak disparagingly and contemptuously of the ministry and all upholders of Christianity. (n) "*Traitors*"—persons who are willing to betray friend and country—to betray the trust of friend, employer, and company—to betray the confidence even of wife or husband, etc., are but too abundant. (o) "*Heady,*" i.e., precipitate, rash. There is no enterprise or project, however foolish and inconsiderate, but what crowds are hurried into it, even if it leads to disturbing the order and peace of society, and ultimately to ruin. Every day is this tendency illustrated the world over. (p) "*High-minded,*" i.e., puffed up, inflated with pride. Men, not merely proud but overbearing in pride, esteeming themselves better than all others in attainments, wisdom, knowledge, etc. are but too frequent. (q)"*Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;*" how true is this of the multitude, who are willing to sacrifice God and His truth for the sake of pleasures, gratification, and dissipation. (r) "*Having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof;*" many profess religion, make a parade of the forms of some religion, but practically allow true piety to have no controlling influence upon the heart and life. Alas, we have this noticeable in the most bigoted adherence to, and show of, forms. Thus far this Scripture corroborated by others,[28] and

as all these characters are existing—not one missing—and that too in large growing numbers, no wonder that godly men esteem such a fulfilment before our eyes evidence of nearness.[29]

19. The *continued unbelief* of the Jewish nation down to the Advent. Some infer the contrary and promise us a great previous conversion of the Jews. The fig-tree putting forth its leaves is taken for a figurative representation of the nation (but it proves too much as Luke 21 : 29 adds "*and all the trees,*") in this transition state, while the parable is simply illustrative of our ability to discern the signs of the times. Aside from other considerations, the continued unbelief of the nation is made apparent from two things : first, the miserable condition it will be in *just previous* to the open manifestation of Christ and His saints, as e.g. portrayed in Zech. 14, which state is *the result of their unbelief.* Second, the manner of their conversion is specifically made *concomitant with the Advent itself*—unbelief continuing down (Prop. 113) until they shall see Him whom they pierced. The 144,000 in Rev. alleged to be Jews, are indeed such, but engrafted ones—with some natural Jews with them—into the Jewish stock. If Jewish tribulation, or Jewish unbelief, were to cease *before* the Advent, then *one of the signs* would fail us, but being seen, and having now already extended over a dreary eighteen centuries, well may we ask, *how long* yet? Surely the time elapsed, has very materially, greatly shortened what yet remains. The unbelief of the Orthodox and Liberal Jews is sufficiently manifested.[30]

20. While this is so, yet another sign, which a comparison of prophecy develops, is important, viz., that as there shall be a restoration of a portion of the Jews to Jerusalem before or when the last great Antichrist (who attacks them) arises, if we are really nearing the end, *a special interest* should be taken by the Jews in the Holy Land with a view toward its ultimate recovery. How this has been recently exhibited by prominent Jews in Europe and other countries is well known ; how earnestly they desire to be there is still apparent from their pilgrimages to the city, the high esteem in which they hold it, and the fervent prayers uttered in behalf of it. The amelioration of their condition in leading countries, the wealth possessed, and power exerted, by them, etc., are all requirements requisite to bring about a speedy fulfilment of the Word.[31]

21. In addition to this one, if the Jews are again to return and occupy Jerusalem, then in the nature of the case, such *a wasting or weakening of the Ottoman power* which holds the Holy Land, should be witnessed as to make it comparatively easy, when the full time comes, for them to regain it. It is contrary to all precedent that Turkey would yield up such a province, so contiguous and advantageous, without a struggle. But crippled and gradually exhausted, the enterprise becomes less and less difficult. Now if we really are approaching toward the end, are nigh to it, we ought to see this process of demolition going on, converting one of the most powerful of empires into so weak a power as has happened, that for many years its civil and political integrity was preserved mainly through foreign powers, and Turkey has been proclaimed "the dying man." All prophetical writers, without exception, find it a truly significant sign.[32]

22. Another is, that we are not only living under the divided form, the disintegrated condition of the Roman Empire, the lower part of the image representative of Gentile times, amid the mingling and commingling of nations, etc., but during *the headless* condition of this empire, a condition which, as Revelation teaches, is not far removed from the end, Prop. 160.

The chronological position that we to-day occupy in its history, is *intensely suggestive* to the careful prophetic student. No intelligent man can study it, and the connection that it sustains to the whole, without being *deeply and powerfully impressed* with a sense of nearness to the end. From the days of the distinguished Mede to the present, every writer on the subject has expressed this conviction *necessarily* growing out of it.[33]

23. In view of the fact that nations shall be confederated against the Christ, the student of prophecy in connection with the evils enumerated, will not forget to notice *the signs in the political horizon.* The political intrigue and corruption, the vast indebtedness, the tax of standing armies, the elements of discord in sectional interests, the strife between capital and labor, the monopolies so largely fostered, the ineffectiveness of law, the bribery in elections and high places, the lobbying of legislative interests, the national sins of the past and present, the direct antagonism of existing parties, etc., we see giving abundant fuel already prepared for the fiery outburst of that wild and destructive storm which is to revolutionize the nations, and make them confederate in anti-Christian policy and attack. It is true, that the prophecy points us more directly to the old Roman earth, but all nations shall, more or less, feel the incoming whirlwind. The unsettled condition of European nations, the social agitation, the destructive elements (again and again pressed down by force), the revolutionary spirit within them, the imperial and republican, the ultramontane and liberal forces, etc., are things so well known that a mere mention will suffice. Yet these are the very things that nearness indicates.[34]

24. Another sign is *the vast activity of the press* in behalf of evil. Gratefully acknowledging the amount of good that it has done, the millions of Bibles, religious books, papers, tracts, etc., that it has printed, yet it is a fact that we ought not to conceal from ourselves that it is still *more powerfully* used in behalf of evil. We leave a man, who has no sympathy with our doctrinal position, and who fondly predicts continued progress merging into a Millennium, give us the statistics of one country. John Angell James (*Church in Earnest,* p. 89), gives some lengthy statistics of the press in Great Britain, the footing of which shows, that, while in one year the issues of absolutely vicious and corrupting literature was 28,826,000 that of Bibles, Testaments, tracts, newspapers, and periodicals of all kinds pertaining to religion, amounted to 24,418,620, leaving a balance of 4,407,380 *in favor of pernicious papers.* To this startling balance, we are assured that millions more can be safely added. Since then such publications have multiplied, catering to the corrupt passions of man. It is simply *appalling* and has become so glaring even in this country, that at times the government had to interfere, in forbidding the circulation of the worst forms through the P. O., and in seizures. Places like New York, Boston, Chicago, etc., send forth daily and weekly an enormous amount. Now if evil is to be predominant as soon as we anticipate; if it is surely and steadily drawing nigh; such *an element of power* as the press ought to be wielded with telling force in its interest. Alas! this too is already accomplished.[35]

25. The astonishing *increase of knowledge* (Dan. 12 : 4), is another sign. If this refers, as many believe, to knowledge respecting prophecy, *then* is it verified in the diligent and successful labors of life-long prophetical students within the last fifty years, and, especially, in the recent efforts of European and American writers on the same subject. But if (to which we

now more specially direct attention) it includes an increase of knowledge in general, connected with a general activity, etc., *then* let this age with its marked progress in all the sciences, wonderful discoveries and inventions, etc., be considered, and is it not strictly true, that, with the facilities now enjoyed, there is a rapid and constant advance among the nations in the dissemination of knowledge of all kinds. The multiplication of educational advantages, institutions, and the devotion of multitudes to varied branches of learning, as well as the astonishing increase of books on all known subjects brought within easy reach of all, is doing wonders in this direction. If it were *sanctified*, it might be a sign of good, but unsanctified as the mass is, it becomes a sign of approaching evil. Mere knowledge and progress, is not holiness, but adds greatly to responsibility ; instead of being regenerators of the world (as many dream) they are mercifully designed to lead us to the only Regenerator, the Christ. The thoughtful ponder such things, in view too of steam and electricity bringing the nations into daily communication and removing the effect of distances, as a state necessarily preparative to the mighty changes which still await the world.[36]

26. Even what men regard as the ordinary outgrowth of nature, or as incidentals in the history of nations, are signs, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, pestilences, wars, famines, floods, hailstorms, cyclones, meteors, plagues, etc. Such things are indeed *continuously* to exist, more or less, down to the end itself *as a part of the entailed curse.* And, if they should fail, if any one of them should fail, *then* God's Word would fail. Being connected with the curse, standing related to the moral, it is reasonable to anticipate, that as we reach toward the end, and especially when humanity is boasting itself in progress and hopes of deliverance that God would *continue* these, if not *intensify* them, *both* as a sign to those who fear Him, and as evidence to the worshippers of nature that her hidden forces are beyond man's control to regenerate. Naturalists and Scientists, unbelieving, laugh at *our* credulity in believing such things to stand for signs, when they themselves within the grasp of these terrible messengers are compelled to admit their *inability* to cope with them, and are as helpless to avert the evil as the babe. Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 796) says : "Considering the inseparable connection between the natural and moral world, which is made manifest in many a word and fact of saving Revelation, it cannot sound *incredible* to us that inanimate nature *also* shall feel the thrill of the shocks, which cause the heart of the animate to quail ; although we hold ourselves utterly incompetent to determine what in this part of the Eschatological proclamation, is to be taken literally and what is not." This is true ; hence while abstaining from particularizing, yet there is *a sufficiency* given to show that the feeling so universally held by the Church in the past, that nature itself, as a sufferer and as a witness of God's *would participate* in testifying to coming wrath, is undoubtedly a correct one. Material forces have constantly in the past been employed by God to subserve moral ends, and it is the most reasonable to conclude that He will *specially* do so as the end of this dispensation draws nigh ; which is corroborated, not only by the past understanding of the great and good but, even by an instinctive dread which thus *anticipates* them, both being founded on the correct idea that they are forces under God's control and command. Now let the reader consider the events of the last twenty years, the constantly recurring evils and inflictions over all the earth, the lack of no

former ones with the introduction of new ones, and with all that is past and present history, consider the constantly recurring wars—as if purposely to show how vain the hopes of humanity—the present attitude and warlike attitude of nations in their heavy armaments, etc., and all these instrumentalities for the destruction of human life and property on an enlarged scale, are evidences not merely of the continued corruption of human nature but of approaching wrath. They teach a lesson if we will hearken to it, of *the long delayed vengeance* coming which even now occasionally gleams across the bosom of nature and fitfully plays with the wrath of man. If the thunderbolts shot forth from disturbed nature upon helpless man; if the woes and horrors of cruel war springing from depraved human nature, cannot and do not arrest the attention of proud man leading him to acknowledge that God must come to remove them if ever removed, and to pray to Him to speedily come and perform so glorious a work (according to His Word), then indeed the lessons intended by Providence and enforced by sad experience fail in inspiring the faith and hope which God mercifully intends by them.[37]

27. Another sign is the distinct "peace and safety" cry. We do not refer to that resulting from the denial of the Supernatural, or the rejection of the nearness of the Second Advent or the spiritualizing of Scripture, or the dreams of progress and the ultimate conversion of the world, but to that *significant* utterance given by "Peace Societies." Such are organized with a large membership of eminent ministers and laymen, publishing periodicals, pamphlets, books and tracts in behalf *of their predictions and dreams* of "Peace and Safety." Refusing to accept of God's delineation of this dispensation down to the end (including war and rumors of war, etc.), and placing in this age the "peace and safety" that *only results* from the personal Advent and reign of Jesus and His glorified saints, they present a glorious (but false) representation of the future, that is eminently calculated to mislead many. (Comp. 175 and 176.)[38]

28. The wealth of the Church is another sign. She is now saying, "*I am rich and increased with goods*" (Lange, "*yea, I have become exceedingly rich*"), Rev. 3 : 17. Whatever it may include respecting professed spiritual riches (Lange, etc.) the language itself decidedly refers to riches literally, so much so that some (Stuart, Wetstein, Vitringa, etc.) confine it thus to earthly wealth, while others (as Barnes) include both ideas. Even such as favor the one idea do not exclude the other, for as Lange (*loci*) remarks: "the connection between external riches and the danger of an inward conceit of riches cannot be ignored." The immense endowments, the costly churches, the large investments looking to perpetuity, the boasted incomes, the parade of vast yearly contributions, the large salaries, the societies with established funds, the educational and publishing interests, etc., all evidence a state of prosperity and riches which is more and more becoming *the pride and boast* of the Church—so much so, that it is taken as evidence of substantial progress to Millennial glory, and the cry is virtually raised, we "*have need of nothing*," i.e., we are indeed rich, having enough of everything. Having wealth, with a spirit of self-complacency, they deem themselves elevated to a high and favored condition.[39]

29. The almost universal desire to become rich, the methods resorted to in order to increase wealth, the gigantic monopolies arising, the hoarding of riches, the aggressiveness of capitalists (James 5 : 1–3, etc.) is not the least sign of approaching nearness to the end. Mammon worshipping,

a determination to be rich without regard to principle, encroachments upon the poor, oppressive measures to secure opulence and luxury, these are characteristics of the last days. How prevalent they are to-day is self-evident, since movements (England, Ireland, Russia, France, United States, etc.) are on foot on a fearful scale protesting against the power and usage of wealth.[40]

30. Another sign is found in the conferences of believers in the nearness of the Second Advent and the reign of the Messiah and His saints, strikingly verifying Mal. 3 : 16 as it stands related to the sparing and the last period of the age. These have been held publicly in England, Canada, and this country ; more private all over the world. Thus faith in God, the covenanted Messiah, the utterances of the Spirit, is manifested to sustain the believer amid the prevailing unbelief and godlessness.[41]

31. The prophetical student finds a feature pertaining to the present period exceedingly suggestive. As the time is approaching for the ending of "the times of the Gentiles," it is evident (in view of nearness) that, because of the predicted arraying of the nations against the Messiah, there should be a wide prevailing interest taken in Jesus of Nazareth *as a Person*. This is apparent by the large number of "Lives of Jesus" issued within the last few years, both Rationalistic and Christian, in which He is prominently portrayed either from an infidel, liberal, or believing standpoint. It is a matter of *grave importance* to find that the former have been most extensively circulated—edition after edition being rapidly exhausted—thus moulding multitudes to regard Jesus simply as a man of mistaken genius, or a liberal Reformer, or a dreamy enthusiast (made so by the prophecies of the nation), or a harmless fanatic, or even a downright deceiver. This becomes a suitable preparation of heart and mind for the drama that is to be enacted against Him and the Church.[42]

32. The *remarkable prominence* given to the Scriptures is indicative of the same nearness. The cheap publication and extended circulation in almost every language of the globe, the numerous aids to its comprehension, the varied versions and translations, the revisions and their discussions, the works in defence of, or against them, etc., has had a tendency to bring *the Word of God* before the people with *such startling conspicuousness*, that God *justifies Himself* in first warning before bringing upon the nations the terrible threatened judgments. The nearer we are to the end, the more prominent should be this interest in the Scriptures.[43]

33. A growing sign is *the exceeding bitterness* of unbelief. If nearing the persecution still future, the spirit of intense hostility, manifesting itself in threats—the mutterings of the incoming storm—should also appear. We have already in another connection, exhibited by quotations and extracts this desire to crush Christianity by persecution. The hatred, intense and unrelenting, is already fully exhibited, and, when the time for organized action comes, will find its victims ready for its vengeance.[44]

34. The turning away from the true Messiah, Jesus the Christ, and invoking another *Coming Messiah*, is a sign of the times. If the coming of Antichrist, the culminated head is near, we should find men already expressing their faith and hope in the Advent of some false Messiah. In the schemes of self-regeneration and progress, we are called to "the Coming Man" (of whom Coleridge, Mill, Kant, Compte, and others, are designated "forerunners" and "harbingers") who shall "renovate society" and bring "a redemption of the world." In the eulogy of

unbelief, in contrast with the Christian Messiah, some kind of a future Messiah is spoken of, and urged to "a cordial reception."[45]

35. A continuous sign is the raising up of false Messiahs; not merely the proclamation of a Coming one, as in the preceding sign, but the actual claim by persons that they are such, calling for adherents. They have been in the past, and they exist at the present time.[46]

36. The moral and religious condition of our great cities is a significant sign of the end. In view of their position, influence, privileges, etc., they ought—if the notion of progress is correct—to be great centres of religion, morality, virtue, justice and piety. The special advantages that they have possessed, the highest talent and ability, the leading ministers, the religious organizations and churches, the missionary operations, the publications of a Christian character, etc., all should tend to make them better, more devoted to God, more free from vice and crime. But what are *the facts* as reported by various classes of writers? We have already shown that they are noted for wickedness of all kinds, for irreligion and impiety, for all the evils that curse depraved humanity.[47]

37. The great stress laid on secular education, as a means of improvement and progress; its extensive usage under State patronage to elevate the ignorant, insure refinement, and secure the welfare of its recipients; its eulogy as a grand instrumentality to stem vice, immorality, and crime —is a sign of the last times in the actual fruitage that it produces. Accomplishing good, especially in giving the advantages of education and intelligence to the poor, yet it must be sorrowfully acknowledged that it is becoming *more and more separated* from the religious and moral teaching, and that it is falling into the hands of thousands who infuse their own spirit of unbelief into their pupils. Education is *not* morality or religion, for, as the history of the past and the present abundantly evidences, intelligence *can exist* with lawless principles, impurity of heart, and atrocious crimes. Thousands of educators are religious, or moral, or sincere in advancing the highest interests of pupils, but thousands, on the other hand, are irreligious, or immoral, or bitter in covert and open hostility to the Bible and Christianity.[48]

38. The signs are varied, and some are not as distinctive as others, and yet they are worthy of mention. (1) If we are allowed to take, as many do, the mixing of the clay and iron of Dan. 2 : 43, as symbolic of the union of constitutional governments with a popular element, more or less pervading, or a commingling of Aristocratic and Republican forms, this is astonishingly manifesting itself among the nations. (Or, if it be applied to the intermingling of nations by marriage, amalgamation, etc., this has received and still receives a striking fulfilment.) (2) The extraordinary answers to prayer and faith. In nearing the end, judging from analogy, it is reasonable to suppose that God would specially exhibit His favor to His people of strong faith. This is done in a remarkable manner, as if purposely to rebuke the existing unbelief, as e.g. exemplified in Müller and others. (3) The treatment of prophecy by unbelief in and without the Church. Its neglect, scornful allusions, contempt, etc., evidence that we are nearing the end.[49] (4) The renewed attention paid by scholars and theologians to an intimate and abiding relationship existing between the Old and the New Testaments, and the numerous works recently published urging this upon our attention. For as "the time of the end" draws nigh, it is reasonable to expect that—in view of speedy fulfilments—

special prominency be given to it. (5) A clear and distinctive idea of the original and true conception of the Messianic Kingdom is becoming more and more prevalent. Books, tracts, etc., are issued which revive and restore to its prophetic position and nature the glorious Kingdom of God. Such writings, as e.g. Dr. Craven's *Excursus on the Basilea* (Lange's *Com. Rev.* p. 93), are becoming witnesses, which we ought to anticipate as the Kingdom itself again draws nigh. (6) Pre-Millenarians are beginning to realize, as they have never before (unless we except the quite early Church) that *the foundations* of their faith rest on two everlasting covenants, the Abrahamic and Davidic. This, as the day is rapidly approaching, we ought to expect. (7) The very large number of works which have been recently published on the Theology of the New Testament, giving, without bias, the actual views held in the Apostolic age (and which we freely use and quote), are not an insignificant sign, recalling the Church, if she heed the call, to *the Primitive belief*, before the catastrophe comes. (8) The astonishing number of works particularly directed to the history of the Roman Empire (the fourth Beast of Daniel), and tracing its varied career and changes, as if purposely to direct attention to its connection with the end. (9) The Lord's table which is a sign (1 Cor. 11 : 26) has not only been a continuous one, urging to the posture of constant watching, but having been such *for eighteen centuries*, and now set forth all over the earth, indicates the nearness of the Lord.[50] (10) The great riches heaped together for the last days (James 5 : 3) is regarded as a sign, no period exhibiting such numerous vast fortunes, such gigantic wealthy companies etc.

Such are the signs which *precede* the first stage of Christ's Advent. Not one of them (just as there was none before the First Advent) shall be of *a strictly Supernatural* nature ; all of them are connected with the natural, or are regularly produced in an onward course of development. If men look for *other* signs, they will wofully *deceive* themselves ; they must be in order to preserve the consistency of constant watching, etc., *all of this very class.* They do not intervene anything between the present and the Advent ; they were present in the days of the Primitive Church and led the faithful to watching ; they were present, more extended, in the days of the Reformation, and caused the Reformers to hope in a speedy Coming of the day of Redemption ; they are present to-day still more *intensified*, and should cause us, if wise and prudent, *to occupy the same position.* We know not the day or the hour, *but the signs are here ;* men of intelligence and ability have failed in their approximative dates but this matters nothing (being what ought to be expected), for the signs are what we are particularly directed to observe, and *they are present ;* men of eminence and piety predict a long delaying of the Lord, a long continued absence of the Bridegroom, and tell us that the cry raised that He speedily cometh is vain, but we take to our hearts of passionate love and desire *the signs that are here ;* others ridicule our hope, hold it up as "Jewish error," "fanaticism," etc., but these reproaches fade away in the light of *a Saviour's command and present existing signs.* Let a cautious writer instruct us ; Dr. Kurtz (*His. of the Cov.*, vol. 1, p. 101, taken from his *Bible and Astrom.*) says : "Reasoning from Scripture, it is scarcely possible to conceive that *the end should be so delayed.* If we think of the incarnation as taking place in the middle age of the world, if we consider *the increasing distinctness in the signs of the times*, and the approach of those signs

and harbingers of the end, we *cannot but feel that the termination of the present dispensation must be at hand.*" And, if we but reflect, that the first stage of the Advent *precedes* this termination by an interval of time unknown to us, it may therefore occur *at any day* for aught we know.[51] We have long felt whatever truth there is in the year-day fulfilment of the Apocalypse (and the Apoc. has been most remarkably constructed to induce watchfulness, and afford a kind of inchoate fulfilment—in fact to impress each century with the idea of a Coming One), yet its main fulfilment, the leading features of portions of it at least, are to be realized during this interval between the two stages of the Advent (and with this view, there cannot be sufficient caution in the assignment of time, seeing that the time specified in the Book itself is not connected with the whole but only parts of it). Even those writers who have advocated and confine themselves to a year-day fulfilment coincide in asserting the nearness of the Advent from their point of view, as e.g. two of the most recent, prominent and able writers, Dr. Elliott, author of the *Horæ. Apoc.*, says: "Our present position, we have been led, as the result of our investigations, *to fix at but a short time from the end of the now existing dispensation, and the expected Second Advent of Christ,*" etc., and D. N. Lord, former editor of the *Theol.* and *Lit. Review*, author of an *Exp. of the Apoc.*, etc., gives it as his decided impression from long and close study: "Christ is *within a brief period* to come from heaven in person." Such testimonies, from scholars and leading divines in the various churches, could be multiplied, but are unnecessary, because every one can see for himself that there is *not a sign* but what is *already fulfilled, not a token* but what is even to-day *abundantly verified*, so that whenever it comes *God's Word is fully vindicated and His truthfulness made manifest.* Scientists, unbelievers, and those weak in the faith demand *a Supernatural sign*, the exertion of direct miraculous power, but all *in vain, because the very signs are intended to test faith.*[52]

[1] Thus, e.g. Pope Gregory (Bede's *Eccl. His.*, ch. 32) in a letter forwarded to King Ethelbert, says: "Besides, we would have your glory know, we find in the Holy Scripture, from the words of the Almighty Lord, that *the end* of this present world and *the Kingdom* of the saints *is about to come*, which will never terminate." He then gives some signs as harbingers of this Coming. (Comp. Lactantius, *De Vita Beata*, c. 14, 25, Cyprian *Epist.* 58, Augustine, *City of God*, B. 22, c. 6, 7, etc.) Luther in his *Dis.* on Luke 21 : 25-36 gives a number of signs as being even then fulfilled, and strongly expresses his hope in a speedy Advent; see lengthy translations given in *Proph. Times*, vol. 4, p. 145, etc., and vol. 3, p. 177 (comp. Props. 78 and 173). Our position respecting these signs (that is, being of a general nature), is shown by what was noticed in Prop. 110, Obs. 2, on the word "observation," to which the careful student is referred, seeing that the Word does not contradict itself.

[2] In view of this extended Humanistic-Infidel movement and its advance, some (as e.g. *Harper's Weekly*, June 22, 1878) advocate a special reunion of the churches in opposition; but, unfortunately, the churches themselves (as we shall show, Prop. 177) are largely leavened with unbelief and pleased with their prosperity. The editor of *The Luth. Evangelist*, Aug. 2, 1878, has a timely reference to the signs of the times as "worthy of study, especially the tendencies of unbelief," and after showing that "in our day the very foundations of religion are attacked," and that "efforts of this kind have become common in books and periodicals, on the rostrum and in the social circle," he continues, "Observing believers view this state of things with alarm," and urges to special efforts to meet these tendencies and to a union of believers on the basis of fundamental doctrines and principles. Numerous papers in editorials and articles sound this alarm.

[3] Barbour and others endeavor to confine the similarity of the days of Noah to the time after the Advent of Jesus. But while it necessarily includes the time after, it also embraces the time at and just previous to the Advent, seeing, as all critics have shown,

that the catastrophe evidences a previous long-continued unbelief in God's warnings. We therefore cannot thus limit it.

[4] We only need append one testimony to those already given. Ponder the statement of Dr. Draper (*His. Conflict between Religion and Science*, Pref.) respecting the "extensive departure of intelligent classes, etc., "from the public religious faith," adding, "*So widespread and so powerful* is this secession that it can neither be treated with contempt nor with punishment. It cannot be extinguished by derision, by vituperation, or by force. *The time is rapidly approaching when it will give rise to serious political results.*" The last sentence is expressive of our views concerning the political power of the coming Antichrist. One of the distressing signs in connection is the affiliation of professed believers with unbelievers. Out of a host of examples we illustrate our meaning by referring to Dean Stanley's address to the students at the University of St. Andrews, Scotland, published in the July No. (1877) of the *Eclectic*, and entitled: "Hopes of Theology," in which the enemies of Christianity are eulogized, and claimed as friends, etc. Such liberality can only result in producing and increasing unbelief. It is well known how many universities and colleges have been fettered by this class of men. On the other hand, many religious papers have eulogized the valuable labors of Joseph Cook, just as if his efforts would succeed in overthrowing the unbelief and destructive work of infidel scientists, forgetting the sad truth—corroborated by all past experience—that infidelity being more in accord with the natural man—being willingly embraced as more desirable than the restraints imposed by God's law—will ever reproduce and exalt the reasoning so oft refuted. To Mr. Cook we are largely indebted for valuable services rendered against scientific unbelief, but in his enthusiastic admiration of science and its progress, he, connecting it with a Whitbyan view of the course of Christianity, unhesitatingly in a number of his lectures predicts that under its influence unbelief will be beaten down, and the world will be converted to a high and universal Theistico-Scientific and religious position. He asserts e.g. (*Biology*, p. 212): "There is no darkness that can quench the illumination which now rises on the world," and which is to go on to a glorious victory, until the world is illuminated, and there arises "the bridal couch of a new day in a future civilization!" Alas! what a contrast such predictions are to those given by Jesus! Our reply, given in detail, to such unscriptural predictions, will be found under Props. 175 and 176.

[5] Reber, in *The Christ of Paul* (ch. 18), argues that the delineation of the characters to be found "in the last days" as presented in 2 Tim. ch. 3, is a forgery. He may well find some excuse to get rid of the portraiture, as he *finds himself too faithfully described.* Others reject every such portrayal of the future as "idle tales" unworthy of men of reason who trace their origin back to the animal. The proclamation of the Sec. Advent and its cognate doctrines are indicated by the arising of these "scoffers" whose attention is thus excited, and by whom they are derided. This derision and scorn shows that a believing people present their testimony on the subject Noah-like, but, like Noah, are made the subject of taunt and sneering. As the New Revision has it, "mockers shall come with mockery," or others (comp. Lange's Amer. ed. *loci*), "scoffers in scoffing"—thus indicating the spirit. Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 41) and Dr. Urwick endeavor to make out that those who said "My Lord delayeth His Coming," were Pre-Millenarians (!), who being mistaken as to the nearness of Coming, then utterly repudiated its nearness. In this *astonishing specimen* of interpretation, they fail to give a single reason how this, with the context, is reconcilable with the doctrine of the Sec. Advent. The doctrine of the Advent is presented, and its remoteness, or a denial of its occurrence is stated. *Who* are chargeable with teaching its remoteness can be easily found in the works of Drs. Brown and Urwick. (Such a statement we may expect from men who, pleading that the Primitive Church was mistaken as to the meaning of Jesus, make out that the Apostles were mistaken as to nearness, and thus invalidate their inspiration). In reference to a denial, we give the following illustrations: Dr. Nast (*West. Ch. Advocate*, Aug. 6th, 1879) says: "Some years ago H. W. Beecher, whose influence upon the public mind in this country was scarcely surpassed, declared in the *N. Y. Independent*: 'I know not whether the Sec. Advent of Christ is at hand or not. I know not *even what the meaning of it is.* That there is to be a literal visit of Christ to earth again they may believe who are wedded to *physical* interpretations of Scripture. I do not so read the Word of God' (as e.g. Acts 1 : 11). 'I believe in a glorious period of *development* that is to make the world's history bright as noonday. What it may be I know not.' Still more sad is it to hear a man like Dr. Bushnell of Hartford, say: 'Nothing could be a profounder *affliction* than a locally descended and visibly present Saviour.'" Alas! when infidels and Christians unite in such repudiation, *the sign* becomes very significant. To illustrate how eminent men

totally discard the Sec. Advent we point to Emerson (*R. W. Emerson: Philosopher and Poet*, p. 33) who discredits the authority of Paul, whose "mind had not escaped *the prevalent error* of the Primitive Church—the belief that the Sec. Coming of Christ would shortly occur." When men once assume a superiority of knowledge—which many today do—over the Apostles, it is scarcely practicable to influence them.

[6] It is one of the signs that, as Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 777) says: "In the nineteenth (century) the importance of the Eschatological—almost overlooked by the Reformers—becomes constantly more universally recognized;" or as Kling (quoted by Oosterzee): "It is not to be denied that our age enters with an earnestness and intensity, such as no earlier one has done, into the Eschatological examination, and presses forward in the complete development of this doctrine, *one sign* among many that we are hastening toward the great decision." This reminds us of Hurst (*His. of Rationalism*, p. 382) saying that "there are many good men in the Church" in Holland, who now cherish "a warm attachment to the doctrine of the speedy Coming of Christ: It is now a more common expression than ever before in that country, 'Christ cometh.'" This is true, as we show in the His. of the doctrine (Props. 75–78) in almost every country, from the time of Bengel, Mede, Wolf, etc. Consequently many cordially agree with the declaration of Dr. Kling (art. "Eschatology," Herzog's *Encyclop.*), that the study of Eschatology so earnestly and successfully prosecuted in recent times, is a sign that we are approaching the great crisis.

[7] Thus e.g. Macaulay (in 1831 wrote, since which time there has been a great increase), "Essays on the Jews," speaking of the Millenarians, says: "Many Christians believe that the Messiah will shortly establish a Kingdom on the earth, and reign visibly over all its inhabitants. Whether this doctrine be orthodox or not we shall not inquire. The number of people who hold it is *very much greater* than the number of Jews residing in England. Many of those who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth, and ability; it is preached from pulpits, both of the Scottish and of the English Church. Noblemen and members of Parliament have written in defence of it, who expect 'that, before this generation shall pass away, all the kingdoms of the earth will be swallowed up in one Divine Empire.'" Compare "The Voice of Warning," by D. T. Taylor, who gives a large list of able writers, theologians and others, who direct attention to these things, including about three hundred in America, seven hundred or more in England, others in Scotland, the Continent, etc.

[8] On the other hand, it is a most impressive sign that so many books, tracts, etc., are published against us. To say nothing of those which are unbelieving and Antichristian in spirit, it is sufficient to point out the works of Brown, Waldegrave, Fairbairn, Berg, and others, and in connection the numerous articles in our religious reviews and papers. The theories, antagonistic, of Stuart, De Wette, Lücke, etc., effect but comparatively few, while the sentiments of Davidson, Hengstenberg, Barnes, Bush, etc., are widespread. Conceding due respect for our opponents, and without questioning their honesty or sincerity, we may be allowed to say as a resultant of our position and views, that they as a body compose a sad sign, *illustrative of Christ's warning* respecting unbelief. In our estimation it is a very serious thing to issue works, expressly designed to destroy faith in the Second Advent concerning its nearness, the duty of constant watching for it, etc. Such must inevitably "*suffer loss*," and great loss, being engaged in misleading others, in darkening "the blessed hope," and in inducing unbelief in the plainest of predictions and admonitions.

[9] The faith of the Fathers is no longer regarded as practically tenable. Thus e.g. the Baptists as a body reject the faith of Bunyan and his co-subscribers to the Confession of Faith presented to Charles II. The Methodists as a body are far removed from the faith of the Wesleys, Fletcher, and others on this point. The Lutherans as a body but little regard the warnings of a Luther, Melanchthon, and others. So with other bodies. How many, e.g. will cordially receive even the scriptural position of the Saybrook platform (taken from the Westminster Assembly's formula), art. 32: "So will He have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and *be always watching*, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, 'Come! Lord Jesus! Come quickly! Amen.'"

[10] No matter that Jesus Himself (Mark 13 : 23; Matt. 24 : 25, comp. Dr. Leask's admirable remarks on these verses, p. 193, etc., *Proph. Times*, vol. 4, No. 12) in direct reference to His Sec. Advent and the events connected therewith, says: "But take ye heed. Behold, I have told you before"—men refuse to take "heed," and multitudes, even of professed followers, totally ignore the caution, and rail upon those who may remind them of the words of Jesus. If this refusal pertained to the unlearned and weak,

it would be sufficiently sad, but it is characteristic of *the learned and leaders* of opinion. Novels and newspapers, reviews and able works, refer to our views in such a manner as to make them ridiculous or to provoke a smile ; the most serious subjects and the most precious of hopes are made a matter for witticism or sarcasm, just as unbelief has made itself merry at the expense of Primitive Christianity and martyrdom. The reproaches cast upon those who receive these things is also one of the signs. Noah was ridiculed, and so will the true believer be likewise by the thoughtless. Indeed, so confident are some respecting the complete removal of our doctrine by unbelief that they predict the same. Thus e.g. *The Princeton Review*, Ap., 1850, p. 329, in an unfavorable notice of Rev. Imbrie's Millenarian sermon "The Kingdom of God," prophesies in view of the revival of the primitive doctrine : "In our day it has experienced a new resurrection, and if we may judge from the past, is destined to a long sleep after a short and turbulent life." More recently Rev. Gladden (*Luth. Obs.*, Jan. 3, 1879) denounced "The Prophetic Conference" at New York as "a compound of literalism, ritualism, and pessimism," and protests that the world is growing "purer and truer, and juster and better." Multitudes express similar sentiments. To illustrate the spirit which opposes us, we give the following : A writer in *The Luth. Evangelist*, Sep. 21st, 1877, in "Recollections of a Pastor," informs us that the world is gradually improving, but that at the present rate "it may require as long a period to effect even an approximate transformation as some of those immense geological periods, say sixty thousand years." After expressing no faith in our doctrine, and after eulogizing the Gospel which "is abundantly able to this great work (i.e. regenerate the human race) without any new miracles," he introduces a Dr. Dobbs, who is made to say : "I have read no less than 1793 authors (!) on the subject (i.e. Millennium), each of whom has proved with mathematical accuracy that it would open at a given hour (!), on a given day (!), or a given month (!), in a given year (!). And in no instance was there a possibility of disputing the accuracy of the computation." (This is a slur on, or slandering of, hundreds of most excellent men and scholars who—like Bengel, Mede, etc., Pre-Millenarians, and Barnes, Faber, etc., Post-Millenarians—only give approximative dates. In the course of investigation we have found only a few out of hundreds who have even remotely assumed the spirit intimated.) He informs us that Dr. Dobbs's sage conclusion was, "it is well to put off the event as far as possible," with which he fully agrees, adding : "Then let us put off the Millennium as far as possible, not because it is not desirable, but because of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the angels. And then let us strike heavy blows at Satan's kingdom with the Gospel hammer until it falls, and upon the ruins be built the glorious Kingdom of our God. Let us no longer be star-gazers, or visionaries, *trying to discover the signs of the times*, but hard workers in the Kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ. Thus we will most effectually hasten the good time coming." The logic that can intervene e.g. sixty thousand years because we know not the day or hour, is only equalled by "the Gospel hammer" which knocks away the injunction of Jesus to observe "the signs of the times." And yet just *such* logic and Gospel hammering is continuously spread before us in our religious papers.

[11] This reminds us how Cotton Mather imitates the direct language of Luther in his *Student and Preacher :* "They indulge themselves in *a vain dream*, not to say *insane*, who think, pray, and hope *contrary to* the whole sacred Scripture and sound reason, that the promised happiness of the Church on earth will be before the Lord Jesus shall appear in His Kingdom. Without doubt the kingdoms of this world will not become the kingdoms of God and His Christ before the preordained time of the dead, in which the reward shall be given to the servants of God," etc. In reference to another point, Ch. Sabine (a layman) in his letter to Dr. Raffles, author of the *Jubilee Hymn* (a hymn illustrative of this sign), says : "We find that some ministers are preaching that the world is ripening into glory ; others, that it is ripening for judgment. We know that *both* cannot be true. We take the standard of truth in our hands at home, in our closets, and we find that one class is teaching a Bible truth, the other a Popish fable. Ought these things so to be ? 'If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle ?' If one pulpit proclaims : 'Peace and safety ! The Lord delayeth His Coming !' and another, 'Watch, for ye know neither the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh,' who can be surprised if the joyous world looks on, listens and laughs ? And listen and laugh it does—such a laugh of merry mockery ! And Satan listens and laughs too—oh, such a laugh of malicious joy ! And the harlot laughs as she hands round the gilded cup, and sings for very wantonness, 'I sit a queen forever ; I shall see no sorrow. The Lord delayeth His Coming. Thou hast much goods laid up for many years. Eat, drink and be merry.'" Let the reader compare Prop. 175 for other refer-

ences. In this connection the student will not forget that the Church itself is represented as esteeming itself rich and on the road to prosperity, when really on the broad road to a terrible ordeal. Alas! the blindness of men.

[12] Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. 2, p. 261) alluding to "dreadful persecutions," "abounding iniquity," "decaying faith," and "*wide evangelization* as the signs of a coming end," adds: "And as we learn from many other passages of Scripture, these signs, as they did usher in the destruction of Jerusalem, so shall reappear on a larger scale before the end of all things is at hand. 1 Thess. 5 : 3 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 2," etc. Justin Martyr reminds the Jew Trypho: "There are some countries in which none of his nation ever dwelt ; but there is not so much as one nation of men, whether Greek or Barbarian, Scythian or Arabian, among whom prayers and thanksgiving are not offered up to the Father through the name of Jesus crucified." Hence in the Apostolic days and afterward this sign of the Gospel proclaimed among the known nations stimulated their faith. For a beautiful and forcible description of the extent of this sign at the present day, see Cumming's *The Great Tribulation*, Lecture 6, "The Last Witness." He renders Matt. 24 · 14, "And there shall be proclaimed, as by a herald's voice or trumpet, this Gospel of the Kingdom in all the habitable globe as a witness" (that may be accompanied, as the Word indicates, with martyrdom) "to all the nations and then the end shall come." But the critical student is reminded of the peculiar phrase "the Gospel of the Kingdom," i.e. the Gospel preached is glad tidings concerning *the covenanted Messianic Kingdom*. It is not simply glad news of repentance, faith, etc., but *distinctively* of the Kingdom. Now this was done in the Primitive Church, and it is done to-day. We have shown in the history of the doctrine and under various Propositions that this *specific* Messianic Kingdom, still in the future, is preached in England, the United States, Germany, Canada, France, Russia, Italy, Holland, Denmark, etc., and by numerous missionaries in the various parts of the globe. This witness is not lacking. Lange (*Com. Matt.* p. 432) remarks: "The preaching of the Gospel or missionary efforts, the most comforting signs of the Coming of Christ." Alford (*Com.* Matt 24 : 14) : "The apostasy of the last days, and the universal dispersion of missions, are the two great signs of the end drawing near." Von Gerlach (quoted by Dr. Schaff, Lange, vol. 1, p. 424) : "The gigantic missionary operations of our days have brought us considerably nearer to the fulfilment of this word of our Lord." Steir (Matt. 24 : 14) : "When the two signs which are connected, apostasy of Christendom and extension of missions, in their wonderful contrast and coincidence, shall have reached their highest development, then the end is at hand." Many eminent men assert that the extension of evil and of missions, going on in strong contrast, is a strong sign of the nearness of the end. Compare e.g. the views of Auberlen, Judge Jones, Ryle, Bengel, Elliott, Lord, Olshausen, Greswell, Seiss, Bonar, Bickersteth, Brooks, Chester, etc. A number of writers (Prof. Gosse and others) declare "that there is not a nation on the earth in which there is not a witness either by the Word of God or by living missionaries."

[13] The attentive reader may compare Props. 177, 178, 180, 161, 162, etc. In addition to the testimonies adduced, the student may refer to *Harper's Mag.*, Dec., 1874, p. 131, where a correspondent of the New York *World* asserts that in England "the real belief in the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension scarcely exists among us." See Gregg's art. in *Contemp. Review*, 1875, entitled "Rocks ahead," also "The Religious Outlook," introductory to *Freedom and Fellowship in Religion*. The portraiture of the Church as given by unbelief (as e.g. Potter, in *Christianity and its Definitions*), although highly colored, contains many truthful touches indicative of the wide contrast between profession and practice, the commands of Christ and obedience. Froude, in the *International Review*, 1878, has two articles on the decay and ultimate overthrow of Christianity, reiterating the spirit of a large number of writers. While some of his statements are worthy of consideration and based on painfully self-evident facts, yet the general tenor of his articles concluding that Christianity is a failure shows that he has no idea whatever of the design of the present dispensation (Prop. 86) and that, notwithstanding the evil, he does not appreciate its past and present power. *Scribner's Monthly* in repeated numbers (as e.g. Oct. No., 1874) declares "an inevitable revolution befalling religion," now in progress, seeing that plenary inspiration, and with it a mass of theology "goes by the board," and "the result will, probably and most naturally, be a reign of infidelity, out of which, after weary wretched years, we shall slowly emerge with our Christianity purged of its extraneous doctrines and with a new class of teachers," etc. It is amply sufficient for us to find, corroborative of our position, that when the Millennial glory is to be introduced there will be such unbelief and retrogression, that (as Isa. 60 : 2) "darkness shall cover the people." Much that men eloquently describe as "light" is "dark-

ness" with God, and this holds good both in and out of the professing Church. Draper (*His. of Conflict*, p. 327, and Preface) speaks of "a great and rapidly increasing departure from the public religious faith, and that, while among the more frank this divergence is not concealed, there is a far more extensive and far more dangerous secession, private and unacknowledged," and hence "a religious crisis is impending," and "in all directions we see the lowering skies, we see the mutterings of the coming storm." Admit that exaggeration exists, yet the simple fact that thousands, including the most earnest and faithful sons of the Church, sound the same warning—this should cause the reflecting to ponder this existing sign. How true is the declaration of Jesus (Matt. 24 : 12) "*Because* (1.) *iniquity shall abound* (2.) *the love of many shall wax cold.*" The influence that the first exerts in producing the second has been painfully evidenced in the history of the past, and is sadly manifested at the present day. Let us give a few statements from religious writers, whose testimony—not being Millenarian—is unbiassed. The *Luth. Observer*, Oct. 18th, 1878, in an editorial, "Popular Religion," says that the Chicago "Alliance" sent reporters to all the churches of that city to count the actual number of worshippers, and, under the most favorable circumstances, reported "that on an average only forty-two per cent of the seats in the churches were occupied by worshippers." The editor then refers to "the City of Churches," Brooklyn, and then reports from recent statements, "that out of a population of 600,000 in that city, only 90,000 could be accommodated in the churches, and that about 360,000 of the people were not under any kind of religious training," and this notwithstanding the numerous churches, distinguished preachers, and exceedingly large congregations there found. The editor then sadly remarks on these facts applying to all other places, and to their grave and discouraging aspect. He then points out the most disheartening feature of all, that "the most who do attend have become so worldly-minded, and manifest so little spiritual life and piety that the difference between them and irreligious people is scarcely observed," etc.; and calls for "a revival needed." If we turn our eyes to countries once highly favored as religious and leading, what a condition they to-day present! Mr. Bauer, chaplain to the Imperial family of Germany, preached (1878) a sermon before the Emperor and Court, in which he gives a bold and exceeding sad account of the widespread immorality and irreligion in that country; so extended, indeed, that the sentence occurs: "Affection, faith, and the Word of God are now unknown in this country, in this our great German Fatherland which formerly justly was called the home of the faith." "Germanicus," in the *Luth. Observer* of July 26th, 1878, gives extracts from a correspondent (an American minister, Lutheran) in Germany, who describes the condition of the Church "to be that of desolation," and that "its state even among the most eminent and godly leaders is that of supineness," waiting for the incoming judgments. Speaking of the prevailing opinion that these are nigh at hand, the writer adds significantly: "The judgments are coming fast enough. It needs no inspiration to behold the signs of the sky. Germany is on the eve of a frightful catastrophe. Sober-minded men everywhere, be they preachers, or merchants, or statesmen, speak with horror of the prospect in view." As Germany is regarded the fountain-head of the Protestant movement, we add a few more sad testimonies. An intelligent and observant friend, Dr. Stuckenberg, writes for the *Luth. Observer* (Feb. 25th, 1881) on "The Religious Tendencies of Germany," and gives a gloomy statement of the parties, confusion, and chaos existing in theology and religion. Among other things, he says, "Our minister, Mr. White (i.e. U. S. Minister) recently told me, that he could not agree with Mr. Joseph Cook in his statements that orthodoxy, taken in the usual sense of evangelical Christianity, was on the increase." He concludes his article thus: "If the above leaves the impression that Germany is still in *a state of religious conflict*, whose issues are very doubtful, it makes just the impression which I want to make. There is great fermentation, there is much anxiety, and there is an uncertain and unsettled condition of religious affairs." In "Letters on the State of Religion in Germany" in the *Times* (1870) it is said: "Who that knows modern Germany will call it a Christian land, either in the sense Rome gives to the term, or in the meaning Luther attached to it." So also in an art. in *Appleton's Journal* (1879, p. 121) it is said, "in Protestant Prussia the very profession of Christianity has well-nigh died out," as seen e.g. in the attendance upon public worship. Dr. Davies, who extensively visited Germany, presented a most deplorable account of religion before the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church (1878), from which we give a few extracts. "Germany is Protestant only in name. The great mass of the German people pay no attention whatever to religion. They are epicureans in every sense of the word. Millions of them are Rationalists, while millions more are materialists and atheists. And although the country is full of learned theological professors, yet very few of them are orthodox. Thou-

sands of the preachers have no experimental knowledge of religion. Few of these pastors believe in inspiration, and even those who stand high among other nations, occupy the platform of the Unitarians. The Sabbath in Germany is a dead letter. The churches are almost empty ; none but women go to church. Take the city of Halle for an illustration. Forty years ago, when it had a population of 15,000, it had six churches, and now with a population of 55,000 it has still only six," etc. While we do know that there are hundreds and thousands in Germany who deplore this state of things, it will not do to ignore such statements made by Americans and others, seeing that they are strongly corroborated and mourned over by Germans of eminence, ability, and piety. Similar facts respecting Holland, England, Switzerland, France, and other countries might be produced, but the thoughtful will recognize those *significant signs* of the times. Recent reviews and papers have taken up and discussed an evidence of retrogression and non-conversion, viz., that in the statistics of several denominations, the exclusions have exceeded the number of deaths, and by adding together the deaths and the exclusions a fearful roll is presented. The uncharitableness, strenuous exclusiveness, and biogtry of bodies of professing Christians, elevating human-devised Confessions, or, without a confession, some engrafted peculiarities (distinctive either in some doctrines, form of government, or some "shibboleth") to a test of fellowship and love, they deliberately unchristianize all others. All outside of their communion and belief is "Babylon." The fact is that *nominal* Christianity on the one hand, and *uncharitable* Christianity on the other, have a large following. We commend the following utterance by a layman : "Greybeard," in No. 61 of his *Lay Sermons*, after showing that Church observances and practices are right and tending to aid a believer in the divine life, truthfully observes that a mere observance of them alone does not constitute a Christian, adding : "Neither an eloquent tongue, nor the ability to teach, nor a profound understanding of hidden mysteries, nor great knowledge, nor large liberality even to the bestowing of all that a man hath to feed the poor, is in itself a proof of Christianity. A man may possess these and still be only sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal (1 Cor. 13). The Spirit of God in the heart and the fruits of that Spirit in life, alone can attest the fact of a Christian, and the reality of his Christianity. These are things apart from and above all outward forms ; they are inseparable from the life-giving and the life-preserving love of God shed abroad in the hearts of believers ; they are not subject to any rules or regulations of sects, and never can be."

[14] Ministers who are favorable to our view are but *too often* denounced in public, and their reputation attacked in private. Many such instances have come under our observation ; and we know men who have *largely suffered* from this source—extending even to covert opposition to their preferment in the Church. A recent illustration of such a spirit may answer. Moody, the Evangelist, is a decided advocate of the Pre-Mill. Advent of Christ, and having given expression to his views in a sermon on 2 Tim. 3 : 16 (pub. in the *Chicago Interior*, Jan. 11th, 1877), Dr. R. Weiser—"as a warm friend of Mr. Moody"—attacks him, affirming (1) that "it cannot but lessen confidence" in him, (2) that "it will create a doubt in the minds of many of his friends (?) as to the soundness of his judgment"—and this is supported by mere assertions such as, that "the personal reign of Christ on earth is a chimera," that Christ's Coming in Matt. 24 refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, that in verse 44 it alludes to death, etc. The assault is sustained by the weakest of reasoning.

[15] What stress the Reformers and others laid upon this sign is aptly illustrated by the language of Luther on Luke 21 : 25-27 (Eng. Transl. *Proph. Times*, vol. 4, p. 145, etc.) when referring to the apostasy, he says : "And this, *above all*, constrains me firmly to believe that *Christ will soon come ;* for such sins are too great for heaven to look upon much longer, and provoke and defy the judgment of God to an extent which must speedily bring it upon them. If it were mere uncleanness, like that before the flood, or only the common sins of the world, as those of Sodom, I would not hold *so strongly* that the day of judgment *must be near ;* but when God's service, God's Word, God's sacraments, God's children, and everything appertaining to God, is disturbed, borne down, condemned, blasphemed, and the devil put in His place, worshipped and honored, and *Satan's lies held for God's truths*, this must make an end of things. As I look around me, I have not the slightest misgiving upon this point. Amen."

[16] Notwithstanding this, and the actual condition of things specified previously, thousands of men in the Church deliberately close their eyes to both Scripture and fact, and prophesy "smooth things." We give a fair specimen of this style, taken from the *Luth. Observer*, Oct. 8th, 1875, the peroration of an article by "Cyanthropos," against Millenarianism, marking the questionable statements as they are crowded together, in brackets.

The art. is headed, "Is the World Getting Better?" and the writer affirms that it is in every respect (while we affirm that in some respects it is better and in others worse; good and evil both abounding). We give the conclusion: "Lucifer, the son of the morning, is waning in the increased glory of the coming day" (? we acknowledge our ignorance respecting this "son of the morning"), "and even now the gold is upon the borders of the clouds and the mountains are tinged with a new-born splendor" (as e.g. in Germany, England, etc.). "He who sees only darkness and gloom, has his back to the light, and is gazing at the distortions of his own shadow" (we know of no Millenarian who sees *only* darkness and gloom). "Blind indeed must be the eyes which mark no hues in the morning (?) of these auspicious times" (and blind must be the eyes that see not the evils existing in the Church and the world). "Perhaps those whose eyes are so beclouded, have been too long looking into the clouds of heaven to see the Coming Son of Man, instead of observing that he is already here (?) in the triumphs of His Gospel. Looking for a physical appearing, they do not see His spiritual Kingdom (?) rising on the ruins of sin" (with the covenanted Kingdom spiritual, and the Coming of the Son of Man spiritualized, it is easy to discern things *not* existing). "They are so expectant of an avenging God to destroy sinners, that they forget (?) the God who pardons and saves" (this seems to be a virtual denial that God will come for vengeance). "Expecting a 'first resurrection' of saints, and a Millennium of material and political blessedness, they forget (?) the more important work of seeking the quickening of souls from death of sin and the reign of Christ in their hearts by faith" (we do not envy the man who can thus deliberately underrate the eminent and pious men of the Church, see Props. 73–78). "Pre-Adventism is always looking for the return upon the earth of antediluvian violence and wrong, and of the conduct of the cities of the plain, and thinks of no other way of terminating these enormities than by desolating judgments and the coming of an angry and implacable avenger" (we only follow the precise and definite language of Jesus, and of inspired men, in preference to the mere assertions—to the contrary, as exhibited by this writer—of men; see e. g. Props. 123, 147, 161, 162, 163). "And to make this Coming an early necessity, it must be shown that the world is rapidly ripening for such a doom as will overwhelm the ungodly with utter ruin" (we leave our Propositions to speak for themselves, sustained as they are so largely by his own class of believers). "The world cannot be converted" (our only reply is found, Props. 175 and 176, for we hold to its conversion, but in the time and manner designated by the Spirit). "The Gospel is inadequate" (we never say so; it accomplishes all that was intended by it, see e.g. Prop. 86, etc.), "and it is vain to preach it with any hope of such results" (if a man preached it with the hope of converting the world, which the preaching of eighteen centuries has not accomplished, it would be a vain hope, but if he preaches it with the expectation of "saving some," "them that believe," etc., he will be reasonable and scriptural). "Its impotence must be confessed by substituting force for persuasion, fire and brimstone for truth, and a general conflagration for the baptism of the Holy Spirit" (? we trust the writer may be able to comprehend what is meant by "the baptism of the Holy Spirit," and ultimately experience it, see Prop. 171. If so, he will assuredly feel that he has unwittingly called into question God's own ordering respecting the future, and doubted its propriety, etc.). An ample apology for our statement is already found under sign 8. The Laodicean condition so vividly presented; the self-exaltation in view of wealth and position; the multitude of liberals, semi-believers, occupying positions of influence and honor; the amazing progress of mere confessional religion; the grave concessions that are made to unbelief; the stealthy or open presentation of doctrines to misguide, blind, and enslave the conscience; the denial of fundamental truths, essential to the vitality of the Christian religion, as e.g. those relating to the person and work of Jesus, the Supernatural, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the conditions of salvation, the sacraments, etc. What we have already said of the condition of countries and cities, favored for ages by the Gospel, fully sustains our position. It is not only the region permeated by the spirit of the Roman or the Greek Church, but those that imbibed that of Protestantism, that evidence such a falling away from the truth. There is a sad force in the art., "The Religion of To-Day" (*North Amer. Review*, Dec., 1879), when the writer claims, as witnessed in France, Germany, England, etc., that "the intellectual world of to-day is drifting away from the religious belief and dogmatic theology of the past," and remarks: "Few can have any doubt either of its reality, or of the direction which it is taking. Its great feature is the slow elimination of all those tenets which have heretofore been considered as *essentials* of religious belief." He shows that this is not merely *outside* of the Church by "leading intellects of the world," but largely *in* the Church itself, and which, he thinks, leads to the displacement of Christianity and the substitution of "a new relig-

ion," that is to " tend to the elevation of the human soul and the unceasing progress of spiritual development." Bunsen, in his Preface to *Hippolytus and His Age*, gives a gloomy picture of the state of the Church and the outlook, and his reviewer (*North Brit. Review*, May, 1853) fully concurs in the statement made, saying : " One thing is sure, that we are at the termination of an old and perishing one (i.e. era)—that there are spreading all around us the symptoms of decay and extinction. God forbid that we should speak in the language of exaggeration, or that we should not feel deeply sorrowful that the old landmarks of our fathers' faith should no longer receive the reverence of their children's children. Yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact before us. We cannot say, peace, peace, where there is no peace." Froude (*North Amer. Review*, 1879) says : " In every corner of the world there is the phenomenon of the decay of established religions. In Catholic countries as well as Protestant, nay, among Mohammedans, Jews, Buddhists, Brahmins, traditionary creeds are loosing their hold. An intellectual revolution is sweeping over the world, breaking down established opinions, dissolving the foundations on which historical faiths have been built up. Science, history, philosophy, have combined to create universal uncertainty, and Catholic France and Italy are no better off in this respect than Germany, or England, or America." We are not concerned in Buckle's estimate (*His. Civ.*, vol. 1, p. 257) that even Theology is diminishing in force and power, since no great works, according to him, have appeared for a long time, for our concern is in the spread of unbelief, heretical views, worldliness, semi-religion, confessionalism, etc. Rev. Clutz and others combat the statements given by Goldwin Smith in his *Decay of Faith*, endeavoring to show that faith still extensively exists. This is also true—for, as our expressed views show, a true faith and a false faith or no faith exist contemporaneously, and either party who excludes the one, in order to give exclusive prominence to the other, is incorrect as to fact, and unjust in estimate. Christianity also, no matter what apostasy and evil exists, is constantly fulfilling the design of this dispensation (Prop. 86). Therefore we have no sympathy with the untruthful and revolting statement made by " The Teacher" (quoted by Mattison in *Spirit Rappings Unveiled*, p. 95), that the " Church is a dead and rotten organization, which is ready to crumble and dissolve," etc. For, notwithstanding the evils enumerated within her, the design of God and of His Christ in her establishment has been faithfully and continuously carried out, viz., to gather out a people for His name.

[17] It is gratifying that among others so many able Millenarians (see Props. 73–78) have been successfully engaged in this work. It is also gratifying that evangelists like Moody, Henry Varley, Wells, and others, so extended in labors, are distinctively Millenarian, thus answering the uncandid reproaches like those under Obs. 10, note. Moody in sermons, etc., has given no uncertain sound, and Henry W. Beecher (Lecture, Nov. 19th, 1875), conversing with him, attributes his power and zeal to his being " a believer in the Sec. Advent of Christ and in our own time"—to his " thinking that Christ may come even to-morrow," etc. At a meeting in Glasgow (1876, reported by the *Christian Weekly*) Moody said : " Like some others, I was originally much opposed to this doctrine until, from *constantly meeting* with it in the reading of Scripture, I was constrained to become a believer in it ; and now it is to my mind one of *the most precious truths* in the whole Bible. And I should feel self-condemned were I to leave Glasgow without speaking about it. All Scripture from Genesis to Revelation should be read as an entire whole, and not a few favorite portions dwelt upon to the exclusion of other parts ; nor should our views of divine truth be merely grounded upon the opinions of others, as every one is responsible for his own individual belief ; and it will be no excuse for persons to say as a reason for not believing any doctrine of the Bible, that they never had it taught to them. The promise and statements regarding Christ's Second Coming are among the things that are *freely given* to us by God, and are *very much* spoken about in the Bible. One verse in every thirteen in the New Test. refers more or less directly to the subject." " Surely if the Holy Spirit has dwelt upon this theme *so much* in the inspired Word, and has brought it before our notice in one thirteenth part of the New Test., *it must be a truth of great moment to all who love the Saviour.* Although the event itself is certain, yet the exact time of its occurrence is spoken of in Scripture as being uncertain, and therefore calling *for constant watchfulness.* Although there will be signs of its approach discerned by those who watch, yet upon the world at large it is predicted to come suddenly." So Varley (*Prophetic Times*, new ser., vol. 2, p. 8), Wells (*Springfield Republic*. Dec. 7th, 1875) and others in public discourses confess their faith and urge to the reception of Jesus, etc. But it fares with these men as with all others of like faith ; their belief is " unsoundness of judgment," as e.g. seen in note (1) Obs. 9. To indicate the bitter hostility that these views excite—as signs of the times—we give two additional illustrations : A

writer in the *Ch. Union*, March 28th, 1877, remarks of Moody: "His Advent views are *a crudity which time has outlawed:*

'He cometh not a King to reign;
The world's long hope is dim;
The weary centuries watch in vain
The clouds of heaven for Him.'"

How "outlawed," when so many leading commentaries, divines, and scholars (Prop. 78) still hold to it? How "outlawed," when it was the faith of Apostles, confessors, martyrs, and is contained in the plain grammatical sense of Scripture? What daring unbelief these few lines contain; misleading and soporific assertions. But again, let the reader consider how we have shown the oath-bound relationship of the future Kingdom to the Messiah's honor and glory, etc., and then read what the *Luth. Observer* (Aug. 23d, 1878) reports Pres. Porter of Yale College, to have said respecting Moody's preaching Adventism at New Haven, viz., that it is a "belief which tends to bring back the spirit of Judaism. I feel bound as a minister of Christ to pronounce this conception of the Kingdom of Christ to be most dishonorable to that Kingdom and injurious to its interests." We venture to say that this esteemed president leaves "the everlasting covenant" of David the inheritance of David's Son, the predictions of the prophets respecting a restored Theocracy, etc., out of his theology as too trivial!

God's work is progressing, and when we see men and women converted, and exemplifying the fruits of the Spirit and the mind of Christ in their lives, no matter in what denomination, or sect, or organization, we see the sign of the approaching end, since the gathering out *is advancing* toward completion. Hence we have no sympathy for that class of men, who, under misguided zeal and bigotry, take the phrase "Babylon and her daughters," and, while giving in the main a correct exposition of its meaning, press it to *an injurious extreme*, as if it embraced without exception everything relating to Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, State and confederated churches, Confessional churches, in brief, *all outside of their own limited little sect.* This spirit is exemplified e.g. in Christadelphianism, Seventh-Day Adventism, Believers, Shakerism, Mormons, etc., etc. These men overlook several things: that while there has been evil in all these churches, there have also been godly men in them who were keenly alive to them, deplored, and resisted them; that to sit in wholesale and indiscriminate judgment upon all is to do gross injustice to that "small flock" which was gathered out before such sects saw the light; that the call "to come out of her" (which means to come into their own sect) addressed to men and women who are devoted to Jesus and willing to give up all for Him, if obeyed would only result in infusing the same narrow contracted view of "charity" exhibited by those callers; that if this wholesale denunciation is to be received, no Christian Church can possibly be traced; that those who employ this language, call upon us to come into their distinctive faith, without being in agreement as to that faith (i.e. various sects use it, and each one claims to be the pure Church alone); that while the ultimate overthrow of the churches under Antichristian persecution is clearly taught, we are also taught that faithful men and women are in them, seeing that the true Church for many centuries has only been perpetuated through them, amid apostasy, contention for the truth, and persecution; that we must discriminate between piety, reverence for God's Word, love to Jesus, etc., and error, ignorance, etc., that may be allied with the same; that in the sight of heaven a condemnatory, uncharitable, and self-exalting spirit is *even worse* than the entertainment of error with a heart full of love to God and man. Hence such writings as Dr. Thomas's, Lincoln's, Barbour's, White's, etc. (however valuable in interesting matter), are vitiated by a species of denunciation, which claim, for their respective sects or organizations, *per se* to be the only true Church, and denounce all others as false and Babylonish. These are simply one-sided, and judge everything by their own humanly-devised standard, speaking evil of men, whose nobleness, usefulness, imitation of Christ, etc., is immensely above their belittling vision.

We only point out that the Prophetical Parable of the Supper is being most strikingly verified at the present day. In the scale of procuring the guests mentioned, we certainly find ourselves, by evangelistic and missionary labors, nigh to the Supper. Let the student compare Luke 14 : 16-24 with the present existing exertions in behalf of the last classes specified, and he will find a remarkable fulfilment.

[18] The celebrated prophecy of St. Malachi (Arch. of Armagh, died 1148) was made, apologetically over against Protestantism, to show "that the Papacy would maintain the Church to the Coming of Christ" (Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 163). This will be verified, according to the Scriptures, in that it will exist at the first stage of the Advent but meet its fall between (Rev. 14 : 8 and 17 : 16) the secret and the open manifestation. While

the Papacy is thus virtually gaining ground again in the number and devotedness of her adherents, she is compromising herself in the effort to secure power, so that she will not, and cannot, gain the leadership and ascendancy ascribed to her by various prophetical writers. The principles, past record, aims, etc., are so diametrically opposed to the principles and aims of the coming Antichrist, that (as seen in Rev. 14 and 17) she too must fall under a terrible persecution, fearfully paying for her pretensions to universal sovereignty. Ultramontanism, however it may for a time materially serve to prop up the Papacy, is doomed by its utterances, arrogancy, and claims, to alienate the Antichristian confederation ; and prophecy directly teaches this by the fate predicted and graphically delineated.

[19] Our remarks are intended to apply to the classes indicated, but they can even be widened to include the temperance movement in some of its aspects. Take e.g. the Murphy movement with which the Church has so largely affiliated. Now the Church itself is God's temperance organization, and the fruits of the Spirit, among which is temperance, are the result following repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This all orthodox churches admit, but going out and striking hands with the world it reverses all this, and, in place of repentance and faith as *the preliminaries*, it substitutes the pledge and in a vague manner appeals to God's help and grace *without coming in God's appointed way*, i.e. repenting not merely of one sin, drunkenness, but of all sin, etc. This suits human nature so well that all classes can associate together, promising themselves the greatest victory. But the end can be readily foreseen ; like all other waves of excitement, founded in a one-sided view of God's Word, it will pass, making it more difficult in the future to arrest the attention of men to the truth. To illustrate the enthusiastic but mistaken (being anti-scriptural and misleading) notions entertained, it is sufficient to quote from a despatch forwarded (May 7th, 1877) to Springfield, O., by Murphy himself, saying : " The country is to be conquered for our King, whose right it is to reign." " We are going on to victory." If the Murphyites and their co-abettors are to do this for Jesus Christ, *then* the Bible teaching on this subject is most certainly incorrect. What the Church itself cannot perform (Prop. 175, etc.) *no outside influence* can possibly accomplish. Hence good, pious, honest, sincere, and able men are doomed to meet disappointment. So it is also with those conventions, etc., that draw together great talent, novelties, sensational things, etc.—whatever good is accomplished is clouded by the insidious notion of prosperity, the conversion of the world, etc. The proof is found in this : that a scriptural representation of the nearness of the Advent, of coming persecution, etc., would be regarded as entirely out of place in them. With Moody we hold that " the only hope of the drunkard is in a renewed heart," and, therefore, are little influenced by advocates of temperance and reform publicly expressing their faith in God's help in the deliverance from some particular sin *when unrepentant* of others. While appreciating the noble efforts of Gough and others—for all true believers are advocates of temperance—we cannot possibly receive their high-wrought eulogies, which represent the temperance movement as one of " the great moral enterprises which shall usher in the day of the final triumph of the cross of Christ." The Bible teaches, as we have shown, just the reverse. Hence all those great conventions, assemblies and organizations which—whatever truth may be presented or good done—eagerly anticipate, and with loud praises predict, the conversion of the world, the unlimited advancement of the Church, and the ushering in of Millennial glory *through their instrumentality*, are predicting falsely and misleading the multitude. A Pre-Millenarian would be condemned, if he ventured to call attention to the biblical statements ; and, indeed, there is little danger of any one ever doing so, since particular care is taken to exclude such, lest a strain of discord mar the smooth prophesyings *so fashionable and palatable* at such gatherings. Men on the brink of fearful times encourage each other by unscriptural but pleasing pictures of reform and progress.

[20] The Bishop of Oxford at a missionary meeting in England made some remarks (reprinted in the *Guardian*, Aug. 23d, 1865) so apt (as " the footfalls of the coming of the great Antichrist") that we reproduce them. After stating that it was his belief that the last attempt against the truth would come not so much in open denial as in a kind of admission while sapping the distinctive features of truth, and describes it as " universal toleration," " a deep respect for religiousness everywhere, always providing that it is not that troublesome thing which, by being believed, affects men's conduct, is any limitation upon their thoughts, or even troubles what is called the course of society. That they will all agree to put out. I have no doubt myself that unbelief contains within itself *the seed* of the most intensely hating persecution the world has ever yet seen. Instead of being tolerant, I believe it is the very perfection of intolerance. I believe that

the very moment it has achieved its own victory, toleration will be the thing above all others it will *hate* with an intensity short only of the hatred the evil spirit himself has for the simple faith of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. It must be so, I think, because unbelief in whatever form it comes is the exaltation of the human intellect and the human will over the voice of revelation and revealed knowledge. It is thwarted to the utmost the very moment that it is met and confronted by the mighty rock of revealed truth. The stream flows on with the most delicious smoothness when there is nothing to thwart it. 'Let us love one another. Let us be tolerant of each other's views. If you choose to worship the devil, worship him if you only do it quietly. If you choose to worship an anti-devil, do so if you do so quietly. Let us go on altogether in our worldly ways and worldly thoughts, holding nothing that may be disagreeable or troublesome. Anything disagreeable in religion is such a shocking thing.' Well, then comes in the most disagreeable thing possible, the revelation of an absolute truth which says : 'We will have nothing to do with this fellowship of evil. You are leading men into absolute destruction ; you are promising them liberty and making them slaves ; you are handing them over to the devil under the pretence of liberty and emancipation from their shackles ;' and forthwith these men turn upon this stern declaration of the eternal verity of God *with all the hatred* of the human heart which the greatest rebel himself can stir up within it." Thus extremes meet : on the one hand, intense, selfish bigotry and exclusiveness, and on the other, a tolerance which ignores the plainest precepts and most fundamental truths. It is sad, that many professed preachers, pretending to be evangelical in sentiment (as e.g. Rev. Murray) affiliate with unbelief, and tell us that the Christianity of the past and present must give place to "*a new religion* of feeding the poor, visiting the sick, reforming the vicious, ministering to the insane," etc.

[21] We cannot help express surprise that, notwithstanding the teachings of 1 Cor. 13, the command of the Saviour to love one another, etc., that men, from a confessional standpoint, or a prejudiced exclusiveness, will speak in terms of contempt and reproach of such an approach to fraternal feeling and good-will. The day is coming, sooner or later, when the terrible persecution of the Church will cause all believers to lose sight of their minor differences, and to receive in fraternal relationship all who sincerely and devotedly love the Saviour and exhibit His mind.

[22] It is a mooted point whether the world is growing better or worse ; both having their advocates. We only say that progress is not piety, and that while a greater amount of good exists *so also* a greater amount of evil is to be witnessed. Thus e.g. take any large city, as London, while more good men are in London to-day than perhaps ever before, its population of criminals, etc., has been also increased. Besides this, taking the standard of the Word, increased light and increased responsibility and wickedness, there can be no question that "wicked men wax worse and worse," etc.

An immense array of statistics might be produced to confirm such statements. An illustration or two will be sufficient. "The New York Prison Association," "the New York State Charities Aid Association," and others give alarming confirmatory statements on one point alone, viz., on the hereditary transmission of evil, evincing (1) that heredity itself entails increased corruption and evil ; (2) that our large cities are growing worse and worse in this direction ; (3) that something must be speedily done to avoid an overwhelming flood, and State help is suggested. Those who so confidently hold that science and art and human development are to elevate the morality of nations, may well consider Rousseau's *Treatise*, which received the prize offered by the Academy of Dijon, on the question, "If the re-establishment of sciences and arts has contributed to render morals more pure?" Rousseau's references to past history (as well as history since his time exemplified in France itself), teaches us that these, without the sanctifying and guiding influences of religion, are *no barrier* against the outbreaks of depravity and corruption ; that they may be employed in advancing pride, ambition, vice, and dissolute morals. So Wallace (*Malay Archipelago*) contends that while civilized communities "have progressed vastly beyond the savage state in intellectual achievements, we have not advanced equally in morals ;" and even adds : "it is not too much to say that the mass of our populations have not advanced beyond the savage code of morals, and have in many cases sunk below it." This view is sustained by various philosophical writers, and as illustrations point to the facts that highly civilized and enlightened nations are guilty of encroachments and acts upon nations lower in the scale, which place them on a common level as to morality, as e.g. the opium trade, past official indorsement of idolatry in India, unjust wars, the treatment of Indians in Florida, etc. On the other hand the advocates of progress, as e.g. Sir Lubbock (*The Origin of Civilization*), Lord Dunraven, and others, contend "that man has, perhaps, made more progress in moral than in either

material or intellectual advancement." The believer, taking the scriptural view, holds that on the one hand a greater advance has been made, but that on the other hand this very advancement, considered in the light of increased light, privilege, blessing, increases not only responsibility but sinfulness. Every treatise on morals admits this standard, and even courts of justice take such in consideration, making allowance for ignorance and superstition. Such advocates of progress indulge in generalities; they do not explain the simplest statistics. They avoid such as the following: the report of Chancellor Hartson of Napa, Chairman of the Committee on Prisons, to the California Legislature, gives the following startling statistics, viz., that the cost of maintaining criminals and paupers has increased far in excess of the increase of population. Thus in 1850: Pop. 23,191,876, and cost $2,954,806; in 1860, 31,443,321, and cost $4,445,143; in 1870, 38,558,374, and cost $10,930,429; so that for 1880 the cost is estimated to exceed $20,000,000.

[23] Also notice Douay Version, which renders Deut. 18 : 11 "or that seeketh the truth from the dead;" Eng. Ver., "or a necromancer;" Luther's Rend., "or who questions or asks of the dead," etc. Dr. Seiss (*Proph. Times*, vol. 9, p. 126) quotes Mede as giving an old writer, Epiphanius, paraphrasing the passage in text: "Some shall apostatize from the sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of demons; for they shall be worshippers of dead men as they worshipped in Israel."

[24] Compare Seiss's *Wonderful Confederation*, Daniel's *On Spiritualism*, Britton's *Modern Amer. Spiritualism*, Fairfield's *Ten Years with Spiritual Mediums*, Hammond's *Spiritualism*, Tuttle's *Arcana of Spiritualism*, Wolfe's *Startling Facts in Mod. Spiritualism*, Beecher's *Review of Spiritual Manifestations*, Berg's *Demons and Guardian Angels*, Ramsay's *Spiritualism*, Oldfield's *To Damonion*, Maskelyne's *On Spiritualism*, Carpenter's Lectures on *Mesmerism, Odylism, Table-turning, and Spiritualism* (*Eclec. Mag.* for 1877), Marvin's *The Philosophy of Spiritualism*, Mansel's *On Mod. Spiritualism*, Dod's *On Spirit Manifestations*, Mahan's *Mod. Mysteries Explained*, a work *Spiritism in the Bible*, Mattison's *Origin, etc. of Spirit Rapping*, McDonald's *On Spiritualism*, a work *Sober Words of Table Talk*, Spicer's *Sights and Sounds*, *North Brit. Review*, 39 : 174, *Quarterly Review*, 114 : 179, Kitto's *Journal*, Vaughn's *Letter and Spirit*, *Blackwood's Mag.*, 73 : 629, *Eclectic Mag.*, July, 1876, Feb., 1876, *Evang. Review*, vol. 7, No. 26, Crooke's *Spiritualism Viewed in the Light of Mod. Science*, Pond's *On Spiritualism*, *Psychic Force and Mod. Spiritualism*, *Inquiry into the Phenomena Called Spiritualism*, *Hints for the Evidences of Spiritualism*, etc. These and other writers are not agreed as to the origin of the phenomena claimed by Spiritualism. Some ascribe it simply to trickery; others to Satanic or demoniac influence. Some to "Psychic Force" (i.e. to the existence of a force, the law and origin of which are still unknown); others to natural causes, susceptible of explanation. Some to "the agency of disembodied spirits," others to "an exclusively mundane origin." Some attribute it to a natural force set in motion by the brain of the medium; others to part imposition, part unobserved natural causes, and part Satanic influence. Some to "odic force;" others in part to mesmerism and clairvoyance. Some to the departed spirits of wicked men; others "to transparent wicked imposition and delusion." Whatever opinion we may entertain respecting it, nearly all agree that it is "a revival of necromancy," or "a Seeking after the Dead," and hence in an enlarged sense "*Demonology.*" Whatever explanations may be given of its varied manifestations, it is sufficient for the prophetical student to know that its main leading idea and profession is particularized as *a sign* of the last times. And when we see tens of thousands, including intelligent, learned and eminent men, its advocates, and when we observe its hostility to the truth and the Church, the sign becomes a signal one.

[25] As this is a very grave charge it will be necessary to verify it. See Harris's *Mod. Spiritualism*, McDonald's *Spiritualism*, and the testimony given in the latter work by men formerly prominent Spiritualists, such as Fishbaugh, Coan, Hatch, and Whiting. See also, e.g. Miss Doten's Remarks in *Banner of Light*, Dec. 3d, 1862, Dr. Hare's *Spiritu. Sci. Dem.*, the writings of Dr. Childs, Newton, Gardner, Wilson, etc. We give an extract from the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, Feb. 20th, 1869: "In licentiousness we find an outcropping of *the God-element* in man. It seems somewhat difficult to attain the end desired, and to make plain to all *that vice may be virtue*, and discord harmony. We do say, however, that virtue is one condition, vice another; *both equally commendable to God.*" No one but a man whose conscience was dreadfully seared could pen such a sentence as this, which Jesuitry, bold as it was in perversion, never dared to present so broadly. The fact is, that in such papers as the *Herald of Progress*, the *Banner of Light*, etc., and in such books as *The Thirty-two-Wonders: or the skill displayed in the miracles of Jesus*, *The mistake of Christendom*, *Communication from Tom Paine*, and a host of others, the rankest

infidelity and blasphemy is boldly avowed. On the one hand, the grossest unbelief, and then on the other a professed admiration for the Bible as inculcating Spiritualism—one blowing hot and another cold to suit every latitude. The saddest feature of all is, that it has evidently well meaning men entangled in its toils, forming, in view of adaptedness to spiritual cravings in others, a powerful magnet to draw in others. But this is to be expected ; an object all repulsive would become speedily loathsome ; but clothe the skeleton with silks and rich fabrics to hide the deformity, paint the mask with a bright countenance, and many, who otherwise would be repelled, hug it in fond delusion.

[26] The moderates would still exhibit a show of respect for Christ, speak of Him as "a model man," etc., but emphatically deny His teaching in many things, ridiculing the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The bold hypocrisy mentioned by Paul is apparent in all of them, in that, professing to admire Jesus, *they refuse to accept of His doctrinal utterances*, which can be tested at any time by simply inquiring whether the sacrifice of Jesus is of an atoning nature for sin. Take the very best of this class in point of pretension and ability, as e.g. A. J. Davis, "the great Apostle" and "High Priest," and although claiming a superior perception of all truth in his "superior condition," he and others deny the resurrection (p. 90, *Phil. of Spi. Intercourse*), the Bible doctrine of depravity (p. 88, same), the atonement (p. 44, *Life of the Spheres*), deride Revelation (p. 129, same), ridicule prayer (p. 35, *Philos. of Spi. Inter.*), sneer at the Bible heaven (p. 76, *Life of the Spheres*), etc. All will use the Bible only in so far as it can be interpreted to contain the elements of Spiritualism and no farther. The whole matter is summed up in Davis's *Autobiography*, p. 489 : "I have no sympathy with any scheme of salvation which rests upon the teachings of any one book in the Bible, or out of it, nor yet on all books combined. On the contrary I believe in the progressive growth and harmonization of the whole human family," etc., and on p. 519 he promises us "the day when, through its influence, the discordant powers and principalities of this world will become one Kingdom of love, wisdom, and harmony." It is stated in various sources that to do this it must supplant Christianity, as e.g. *Banner of Light*, Ap. 10th, 1869, and addresses of Middlebrook, Higging, etc., at Chicago Convention, 1874), etc., comp. Dr. Potter's, himself once a leading member and medium, pamphlet *On Spiritualism*, pub. 1866, for the internal working of the same.

[27] Various estimates of the numbers connected with Spiritualism are given running into its millions. Thus e.g. the *Contemp. Review*, Aug., 1872, p. 439, says they are estimated "from six to ten millions." The *Pop. Science Monthly*, which has no sympathy with it, occasionally refers (as e.g. Sep., 1879) to the large extent of its following among scientific men in England, Germany, etc., and the adhesion to it in this country. It is a matter of surprise that intelligence can tolerate "the trash" which is represented as coming from Jesus, Bacon, Luther, Washington, and a host of eminent deceased persons (seeing that it would evidence a wonderful retrogression of sense, genius, power, etc.), or (*Westminster Review*, Jan., 1858) the story of "a lady who was brought to bed of a motive power," "the doggerel verses purporting to emanate from the Saviour Himself, compounds of the ludicrous and horrible in which the laugh due to their absurdity is checked by the shudder at their blasphemy." Even such a writer as Howitt (*His. of the Supernatural*), in his apostleship of Spiritualism, endeavors to shield the practice of modern necromancy from the condemnation of the law of God by (p. 197) saying that in the transfiguration Christ "sought to the spirit of the dead," and "broke the law before the face of Moses." A man must certainly be easily satisfied with proof favorable to his system, who can find in this occurrence any likeness whatever to the present necromancy. It can only be made out by a gross perversion and prostitution of a sublime typical representation (Prop. 153). The author of "Modern Sorcery" (*Brit. Quart. Review*, repub. in *Eclec. Mag.*, Feb., 1876) refers to the fact that Paul, Jewish saints, and prophets, and even Jesus are represented as visitants attending seances, and uttering sentiments antagonistic to their historical character, but in accord with the unbelieving, humanitarian spirit of the mediums. No wonder that it requires a darkened chamber to bring forth these manifestations of darkness, from which no name of the past, however venerable, is safe. In our remarks on Spiritualism, we do not include all as entertaining the same spirit, for some are evidently sincere in a reverence for the Bible, and seem pained at the extremes of the ultraists, but still their adhesion, etc., is injurious, and confirms unbelief. Mrs. Hardinge Britten's Spiritualistic Lectures at Melbourne, Australia (*West. Ch. Advocate*, Aug. 6th, 1879), were unsuccessful, and she assigns for it the following reason, which speaks for itself : "Because of the splits in the Spiritualistic camp, and because there were those who believed in the doctrine and rejoiced in the uprooting of old institutions, and made use of the new creed as an excuse to relieve them

from *all restraint and for indulgence in licentiousness.*" The truth is, that whatever esteem may be professed for the Bible in behalf of Spiritualism, the *animus* is seen in the constant efforts made to lower its inspiration, credibility, and authority. The proof for this can be readily seen in any extended Spiritualistic catalogue of books, as e.g. in the catalogue of the "Banner of Light Book-store," containing the works of Tom Paine, Voltaire, Volney, etc., specially recommended. Then we have such writers, bitter and unrelenting, as Denton, Fish, Finney, Cooper, Winans, etc., on the Bible, Tuttle on Nature, Mrs. King on Man, Hull on Reason, Craven on the Old Test., Randolph on Pre-Adamite Man, Frothingham on Humanity, and a multitude of others, who all endeavor to make the Scriptures unreliable, opposed to science, nature, and the true progress of humanity. Nor need we be surprised at this, when Childs has the effrontery to proclaim as a fundamental truth, "whatsoever is, is right;" when Reade makes the individual man "lots of animated jelly," to be swallowed up in a perfected humanity; when Wright makes his co-workers have as much of God in them as Jesus ever exhibited. They exult in disposing and circulating the intensely hostile works of Bradlaugh, Bob Ingersoll, Holyoake, Underwood, Parker, Voysey, Feuerbach, Bauer, Renan, Harrison, Marvin, Watts, Barnard, Buechner, Lum, Meredith, Offen, Orcutt, Schefer, Weiss, Alberger, Hazard, Putnam, Peebles, Watson, Smythe, Doten, etc., etc. However we may account for Spiritualistic phenomena, whether to mind reading, natural causes, Satanic influence, demonology, or imposition, its *impotency* as a Supernatural agent is clearly evidenced by a simple test, viz., let any one carry with him to a medium a communication in a sealed envelope given by a third person, of whose contents he himself is ignorant, and no Spiritualistic influence can tell what is in the envelope. The *Pop. Science Monthly* (June, 1879) refers to the fact that a one hundred pound note was left in a sealed envelope in the Bank of England, the owner having promised to give it to any Spiritualist who could tell the number of the note; but not even an application was received. Some of its advocates, as R. D. Owen (*Debatable Land*, p. 239), are candid enough to admit that mistakes, errors, delusion, etc., may exist in connection (but claim the process of sifting as necessary), and that infallibility cannot be attributed to its teachings.

[28] The sorrowful, judgment-denounced catalogue can be readily swelled, as e.g. in the open blasphemy and oaths so widely prevalent and falling even from the lips of children; the extravagance in dress in meeting the demands of imperious fashion leading to many sad consequences; the increasing boldness of so many girls and women in following after pleasure and amusement, etc., by which modesty, home life, etc., are sacrificed for the sake of publicity and vulgar notoriety; the immense traffic in and use of intoxicating liquors with its resultant evils; the direct trade kept up in maintaining the means for gratifying sensuality with its demoralizing effects; the fearful increase of divorces and the easy manner in which many are obtained; the unhappiness and infidelity connected with the conjugal relation arising from the violation of law, etc.; the increase of murder, so that often several are embraced in the same daily newspaper; the spirit of free-lovism; the publication of obscene pictures, books, and papers; the racing, games of chance, etc., leading to gambling; the manipulations of stocks, provisions, etc., for the purpose of making money at the sacrifices of others, etc.

[29] Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com. loci*) refers the fulfilment of this passage in particular to "the last days of this era, which precede immediately the last personal Parousia of the Lord." (1 Pet. 1 : 5; 2 Pet. 3 : 3), and says: "It is here also revealed that the optimistic view of the world, which expects but a continuous triumph of humanism, an advance steadily to a higher freedom, culture, and dignity in the future, *cannot stand* before the tribunal of Scripture." So on 1 Tim. 4 : 1–5 he remarks in the same spirit: "The dark visions which Paul opens to us of the future directly conflict with the optimistic and sanguine hopes of those who believe that, from the unceasing growth of knowledge, all on earth and in the Church of Christ is becoming always better, more harmonious, more peaceful. The same Scripture which gives the promise of the last glorious day for the Christian, utters its *ever-increasing lamentations over the last times* which are to precede that day." The newspapers are constantly portraying such characters, and the number is increasing. While writing, a reference to to-day's *Cin. Enquirer* (July 22d, 1881) finds its accustomed burden of sad and fearful news; and one of the columns contains this declaration: "Comet or no comet, this year (1881) starts in right to become famous for murders, assassinations, shipwrecks, tornadoes, conflagrations, floods, scandals, and other sensations. Deviltry seems to move with the speed of an express train."

[30] As stated previously, large numbers are Rationalistic, and eagerly adopt the conclusions of Strauss, Bauer, Renan, and unbelieving scientists. Others remain orthodox (i.e. hold to the old faith) as e.g. Rabbi Artour (in *Sermons Preached in Several Synagogues*,

1874), avow their belief and expectation of a Supernatural Person in the Coming of a Messiah, but reject the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship. Another party make the Messiah only "a figurative personification of a Millennial period," etc. But this very unbelieving condition of the Jews, and hence an unwillingness to return to Palestine, is given as a distinctive sign in Ezek. 20 : 30, etc. They give up faith in the predictions of God, and, therefore, say, "We will be as the heathen." While this has always been, more or less, true of the ten tribes who have become amalgamated among nations, it is now specially true of the whole nation. While a large portion is orthodox in its faith of a Coming Messiah, and await Him, another large and growing portion is unbelieving, and desire to be incorporated with the nations among whom they live. This is seen in America and Europe e.g. by the purchase of real estate, the funding of local interests, and intermarriage with Gentiles. We only add that the recent terrible persecution of the Jews in Russia and Poland calls the attention of the nations—if they will heed it—to *the prophetical status* of that nation.

[31] The prophetical student will not overlook the significant fact that just as the Pre-Millennial prophetical periods are expiring (as all admit), the greatest power is lodged in the hands of Jews, not merely monetary but political, as e.g. in Lord Beaconsfield, the Prime-Minister of England. This assumes importance when the additional fact is observed that nearly all, if not all, commentators are agreed that the friendly power ("the ships of Tarshish") which will aid the Jews to a partial, preliminary restoration is England. As the time is approaching, such indications should be witnessed, and their appearance are confirmatory and strengthening. Indeed, there has been a lively interest taken in the Jews by eminent Englishmen (Lord John Russell, etc.), and that friendly feeling is widening and extending, until *policy* itself allied with it shall indicate the restoration of the Jewish nation as the best means to secure a friendly ally in the East as a protection to England's interests over against Russia's encroachments. In view of the large and increasing Jewish population in Palestine, Dr. Edersheim well said : "The return of the Jews to their own land may be said to have already commenced." Various disabilities, formerly enjoined by the Turkish power, have been removed ; the freedom of purchasing property and of building has been given them, and (London *Times*, March 20th, 1877) numerous new buildings are erected by individuals and societies. Assistance is furnished from Europe and America to establish a permanent and flourishing settlement. The placing of Asia Minor, including Palestine, by the Treaty of Berlin (July, 1878), under the Protectorate of England, has facilitated confidence in this direction. The great leading Jews of the old world, with their vast wealth and influence, are taking a deep interest in this matter. Protestants are, likewise, impelled by the prophecies relating to the future of the nation, having an increasing interest in the restoration of the Jews. This is apparent from the numerous works published advocating their restoration and conversion, such as by Faber, Bichino, Calvert, Scott, Fletcher, Colyer, Cooper, Thelwall, Bickersteth, Crool, Durell, Herschel, McNeile, Tyso, Maurice, Whiston, Maitland, Wood, Eyre, Whitaker, the Bloomsbury Lent Lectures, fourth series, 1847, and eighth series, 1850, Da Costa, Cunninghame, Frey, Thomas, Girdlestone, Guers, McCaul, Keith, Maton, and others. The German Jews alone (*Luth. Obs.*, July 17th, 1879) have sixteen charity associations in Jerusalem, and where eighty years ago the Turks only allowed 300 Israelites in the city, thousands are found, entire new streets being laid out and built. The Palestine Exploration Society has already mapped out on an inch scale about three fourths of Palestine, while the chart of Jerusalem and its environs are on the large scale of ten feet to the statute mile. The Palestine Exploration Fund in its prospectus said that it was organized to pierce those mounds of *dust and stones* around Jerusalem," which some think is a fulfilment of Ps. 102 : 14, "God's servants shall take pleasure in her stones, and favor the dust thereof." Many items of interest are given in Jewish and Prophetical periodicals, indicative of the spirit actuating many Jews, who are looking forward to a re-possession of their land of promise. The influence and rank that the Jews have attained is favorable to such a development. George Eliot (*Impressions of Theophrastus Such*, p. 223) remarks : "A significant indication of their natural rank is seen in the fact that at this moment the leader of the Liberal party in Germany is a Jew, the leader of the Republican party in France is a Jew, and the head of the Conservative ministry in England is a Jew." In science, art, literature, politics, wealth, etc., they are becoming a power.

[32] Numerous prophetical writers have insisted upon it that the weakening of the Mohammedan power, the overthrow of the temporal sovereignty of the Papacy, the beginning of a gradual return of the Jews to Palestine, and the political and social perplexities of nations, being synchronous, form indisputable evidence of the nearness to the end

of the age. In reference to the state of the Ottoman power, the works of Dr. Cummings, Keith, and others (as well as leading papers, such as the *London Times, N. Y. Herald*, etc.) contain abundant evidence of its growing decrepitude. Its fires, taxation, indebtedness, wars, loss of territory, internal and external complications, corrupt principles and officials, etc., has wonderfully crippled its resources and strength. We give, out of a multitude of testimony, a single extract, taken from the *North Brit. Review* (Nov., 1860, p. 179): "The days of Turkey's power and independence have long since gone. The Empire exists only upon sufferance. Nay, its tottering throne and rotten constitution are upheld by the united efforts—or rather united jealousies—of the European monarchs. From the attacks of enemies without, and rebels within, England and France have been for years, and are at this moment, its only defence. Every Englishman knows that but for the unceasing exertions of our ambassadors at Constantinople, and of our consuls in the Paschalics, the vast Empire would, long ere this, have gone to pieces. We venture to affirm that were these influences wholly withdrawn, and were Turkey left to her own unbiassed counsels, it could not hold together six months." It is a universally known fact that the interference of other nations has alone saved Turkey from being overthrown and rooted out by its powerful and covetous neighbor, Russia.

[33] And here we would observe: whatever defect may appear in the details, the grand outlines always remain unimpaired. Men have foolishly made themselves merry, e.g. at Baxter's Napoleon III. scheme, without ever considering that the detailed scheme presented by him failing in particulars and as an entirety, does not affect in any *essential point* the outlines of this prophecy (upon which, and within which, his theory was erected), or his view of the nearness (although he antedated) of time. To-day, with all his failure, we would rather be in his position, *honoring God's Word*, than in that of those who neglect it.

[34] The forces at work in nations, and which effect the political action, are of such a tremendous influence that statesmen, philosophers, etc., have freely uttered their belief in a coming crisis. Not merely the Nihilistic, Communistic, Socialistic, etc. give warrant to such a view, but the manifest distrust of nations toward each other (exhibited in their vast standing armies, heavy armaments of war, improved engines of destruction—Krupp alone, as the papers state, turning out every month 300 cannon, some of the largest calibre, while the standing armies of the five great European powers, including reserves, form a total of 16,471,918), and the intense hatred and jealousy existing between them (as e.g. between Germany and France, Austria and Germany, Russia and Turkey, Italy and France, England and Russia, etc.) will inevitably lead to commotions and great changes. The future formation of the ten kingdoms and their confederation under Antichrist will, inevitably, be preceded by revolutions and wars in which the nations will become involved. While we locate the formation and confederation in the interval, yet if near to such an interval signs expressive of agencies at work to produce the same ought even now to be manifested. These, in the present condition of the earth, are only too manifest; but it is too soon to map out (as some writers attempt) with any degree of accuracy the order of events. The prophecies bearing on them are exceeding brief, and deal chiefly with results, so that both wisdom and prudence suggest the suppression of such efforts, which, at most, would be based on conjecture. When such men as Disraeli, Hyacinthe, Peel, Victor Hugo, Chase, and many others judge from "the signs of the times" that we are entering upon a conflict that will convulse the nations, and predict a period of terror and bloodshed, it certainly cannot be charged against them that they are biassed by Pre-Millenarian sentiments. Indeed, it is folly to close our eyes *to existing facts*, which elicit such gloomy forebodings from eminent men; especially when men of a calm and reflective mind like Dr. Arnold (quoted by Cummings, *Lects. Apoc.*, 1 ser., p. 469), looking at the antagonistic and corrupting influences at work, declares: "My sense of the evils of the times that are coming, and of the prospects to which I am bringing up my poor children, is overwhelming; times are coming in which the devil will fight his best, and that in good earnest."

[35] The student can refer to other statistics, given by Pierson *On Infidelity*, and by *The Power of the Press*. Christlieb's *Modern Doubt* (p. 33) confirms such statements, and the extent of infidel publications is pronounced (sec. 1) to be "fearful." Why *deliberately ignore* facts evidencing the strength of the enemy; is it wise or prudent? Appleton's *Cyclop.*, art. "Bookselling," says that "it was in evidence before the House of Commons in 1851 that the sale of immoral and infidel publications amounted to 29,000,000 annually; more than the total issue of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, the Religious Tract Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Scottish Bible Society, and some seventy religious magazines combined." This list, as eminent

writers assure us, has been greatly swelled, catering to the multitude outside of the churches. I have myself noticed entire and lengthy catalogues filled with this class of works, and many of them recently published. They embrace books of the most blasphemous nature down to a more refined kind which substitute morality, the religious sentiment in man, etc., for Christianity. It is a matter of surprise that even some religious writers, not seeing the dangerous tendency of sceptical literature, apologize in its behalf, as e.g. the *Christian Union*, Aug. 1st, 1877, speaks of Buckle's *His. of Eng. Civilization*, Draper's *Intellectual Development of Europe*, and his *Contest between Science and Religion*, Lecky's *His. of the Rise of Rationalism*, his *Supernatural Religion* etc., as simply *a preparative* work for Christianity. Alas! thus the signs of the times are read, respecting works which generate and confirm unbelief in the minds and hearts of thousands of readers—a class of readers, too, that exert influence. The *Princeton Review* (Ap., 1854, p. 375), after reluctantly admitting that, as "Pierson on Infidelity" showed, the press was employed more extensively against the truth than in its behalf, says: "There are constantly issued in our cities publications which are *powerfully destructive* in their tendencies. We cannot better define the class than to describe one which came to hand not long since. It offered itself as a Gospel to the poor, and then proceeded by an appeal to Scripture—introducing our Saviour Himself as a great Reformer—to establish these two principles: that the poor have an equal right to the possessions of the rich, exhorting them to bide their time, but to be in readiness to take what belonged to them when the time should come, or when opportunity should offer; and, secondly, that marriage was an unjust and tyrannical institution, and ought to be destroyed. All this was done not in the bare form in which we have stated it, but in the most plausible method, and with a style calculated to persuade men of the sincerity and purity of the author." The writer, summing up the appalling statistics, and the various classes of works, adds: "Taking the whole field in which the press operates, we can hardly doubt that *its preponderating influence for the present, is against the truth*, or indifferent to its interests—that that instrumentality which God has chosen, above all others, for the advancement of truth and goodness, has been strangely turned to work their overthrow." The *Luth. Observer* (June 6th, 1879) remarks: "Infidelity has its publications almost everywhere. Dr. W. Fleming Stevenson says that the commonest book in the Calcutta Bazaar is a cheap edition of Tom Paine, and that there are a number of antichristian papers published in Bombay." Such testimonies, coming from parties not Pre-Millennial in view, could be multiplied, but every reader can make a comparison for himself, when considering the number of directly and semi-infidel works and periodicals, the fashionable literature of an irreligious character, the unbelieving scientific and metaphysical books, the histories and school books leavened with error, the licentious works circulated, etc.

[36] Both of these conditions, an increase of prophetical knowledge and an increase of knowledge pertaining to nature and the utilization of its forces, are demanded as forerunners of the Millennium; the one as a warning to watching, and the other as an indication of coming fulfilment of events that can only be compassed by extraordinary means utilized by Antichrist and his confederated forces. Therefore we bring them together in the form given in the text, although we firmly hold that the knowledge spoken of by Dan. 12 : 4 pertains *exclusively* to the one vision that was sealed, which will not (as to its conclusion) be fully understood until "the time of the end" (which we place in the interval between the two stages), when it will be thoroughly comprehended in view of the events transpiring, and the precise chronological status being recognized. Evidently the meaning of the Prophet (Lange's *Com. Dan. loci*) is: "But (And) thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book, even to (till) the time of the end: many shall run to and fro (run through the book), and the knowledge (of it) shall be increased," or "many shall search it through, and the understanding shall become great." Unity requires that the running about (for the purpose of searching) and the knowledge spoken of as gained, must be applied to the vision that is sealed. Consistency likewise demands that so far as this particular vision is concerned (for the sealing does not refer to the other prophecies), the full, complete understanding of it (as e.g. to the several dates, the time of resurrection of the saints, the conflicts pertaining to the last Antichrist, etc.) will only be attained at "the time of the end" (which we locate, not in the present but in the future interval, Prop. 130). This, at once, sets aside much that has been derived from the phrase in support of certain ultra prophetical expositions (as White's, Swormstedt's, etc.) as if they were heaven-derived. It also refutes the notion that the verse refers to the present rapid locomotion by steam, or to missionaries going about to preach, or to the prophecies in general (compare Fausset, Barnes, Gill, Clarke, Henry, etc.). The declaration that a complete understanding of this prophecy in its details and dates is still some-

thing which pertains to the future, does not forbid our understanding its general meaning, its location as to the period of fulfilment, its reference to the resurrection, or the Antichrist, or Jewish deliverance, its correspondence with other predictions. This limitation as to the one vision does not effect our comprehending other predictions, or being impressed and guided by the signs given respecting the nearness of the Advent. The reason for the non-comprehension of a part (conclusion) of this vision, is found in the fact that a portion of it runs into and through the interval between the concealed and open Advent. The assurance given that it also shall be fully understood, shows how important a vision it shall be regarded by believers during this interval. In reference to prophecy in general it is still true (Hos. 14 : 9), "*Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent and he shall know them?*" for it is requisite to search after the truth so that we may follow Christ's injunction (Matt. 24 : 15 ; Mark 13 : 14), "*Whoso readeth, let him understand.*" All things really necessary to form *an intelligent and just view* of the incoming future with its events of vengeance and redemption are fully and freely given ; and it argues a lack of respect to refuse their consideration and study. This gives propriety and force to the caution of Jesus (Mark 13 : 23) : "*But take ye heed ; behold I have foretold you all things.*" The promise of Deut. 29 : 29 (Houbigant's rendering) : "*The things which were hidden with the Lord our God, are made manifest to us and our children for many generations,*" has been richly verified, but to realize this practically, it is still essential to "search the Scriptures." Owing to Abraham's interest in the covenant God revealed (Gen. 18 : 16) to him things of the future, and it is owing to the deep *personal* concern that believers have in the same covenant that God has enlarged our views of the times to come. He, therefore, perpetuates persons who are like "the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times," in order that believers may be sustained and strengthened, and that an abundant testimony may be given to the Church and world before the incoming flood. The fact that the study of Eschatology and prophecy has wonderfully extended is a strong sign of our nearness to the end. Dr. Seiss (*Ch. Herald*, June 24th, 1879) says : "How evidently and significantly has this mark of the end been manifesting itself within the last fifty years ! Though the multitude will turn from prophecy as from a sealed book, yet what a stir, anxiety, and study has it awakened in many earnest minds ! By some in every denomination and in every Christian country the subject is being studied and agitated. Everywhere there are men of God proclaiming the great doctrine of Christ's speedy Coming to reign with His saints upon the earth. In England, in Scotland, in France, in our country, in Germany, in Russia, in India, in the isles of the sea, the cry has been raised, 'Behold, the Bridegroom cometh : go ye out to meet Him.' *Never, never, since the days of the early Christians,* has there been so much earnest longing, expecting, preaching, believing, and praying upon the subject of the nearness of Christ's Coming. The interest, the study, and the faith are by no means as general as they should be, but general and intense, earnest and enlightened enough to warrant us in saying *that this sign of the end has appeared.*" (Comp. preceding Prop. on this point.)

[37] Our position is that of thoughtful men—persons too that cannot be accused of much sympathy with us in our doctrinal attitude. Thus e.g. Dr. Arnold (*Life of*, by Stanley, vol. 1, p. 270), in a letter to Rev. Blackstone, first refers to successive ages and the coming of the day of the Lord, and then expresses his belief in *physical* and moral convulsions at the termination of those ages (with which compare Niebuhr's *Lebens Nachrichten*, vol. 2, p. 169). Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. 2, p. 263) makes the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars and shaking of the heavens, "signs which may have a meaning both *literal* and metaphorical." Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com.* Luke 21 : 25) asserts that we should "simply believe our Lord at His Word ; that His Parousia will be accompanied with *cosmic revolutions*, whose actual course can be as little calculated as their possibility can be denied *à priori*. It was known even from the Old Test. that fearful signs *in the realm of nature* would herald the day of the Lord (Jer. 4 : 23 ; Joel 2 : 30, etc.)." (Compare Alford, Whedon, Owen, Wordsworth, Olshausen, Calvin, Meyer, Lange, etc.). In the Obs. it is said that such signs shall be intensified—this will necessarily lead to destruction of life. Thus, e.g. take earthquakes : let such an earthquake as that which had its centre at Madrid on the Mississippi be repeated, and, owing to the large cities and towns erected (with high stories and weak walls) within its radius, terrible indeed would be the loss of life—frightful and overwhelming devastation. So, likewise, with plagues, pestilence of animal and vegetable life, famines, storms, floods, earthquakes, disasters, strange and marvellous occurrences—these too will be made manifest, so that the worshippers of nature (believing that through nature man's condition can be ameliorated and made perfect) shall feel their own incompetency to remove the pressing

curse, which presses the more heavily as the end approaches. The signs are continuous and multiplying (as e.g. see the tabular statement of the increase of earthquakes, *Proph. Times*, vol. 7, p. 177), and "the dark day" and "memorable falling of the stars" (meteors), which some few writers utilize to make out some favorite dates, are only in the line of things which it is most reasonable, from Scripture representations, to anticipate. Such a sign as that given in Hab. 3 : 17, the failure of crops, is more or less manifested, and will be severely realized at the time of the Advent, and especially during the interval, to teach, if possible, men their dependence upon a higher power, and their impotency to relieve themselves from the entailed curse.

[38] The "Peace Congresses," the "Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations," the writings of Upham, Gurney, Webster, Spiess, Burritt, Allan, Buckingham, Godwin, Mahan, Clarkson, and others, in behalf of Peace, certainly contain much that Religion, Morality, Reason, Prudence, and Humanity urge upon us. The claims of peace, the inestimable blessings that would flow therefrom are forcibly presented. But the predictions, the eloquent prophecies presented, the flattering portrayal of the future, the unfounded quotations and perversions (as to order of realization) of the Scriptures, are *flatly contradicted* by the Word of God. The Spirit that knows all things, and what is in man, plainly informs us that such representations are *vain dreams*, for we are distinctly told that war will, more or less, *continue* during the entire dispensation down to the Second Advent. It is given as *one of the signs* of the end, and it culminates in the dreadful war inaugurated by the Antichrist, being cherished by the perpetuated depravity of man, which in its selfishness fosters the inhumanity and iniquity of war. That the reader may judge of the tone and tenor of these predictions, we present a few extracts illustrative of their spirit. Victor Hugo, before the Peace Congress assembled in Paris, 1849, said : "Gentlemen, this sacred idea, universal peace, all nations bound together in a common bond, the Gospel for their supreme law, mediation substituted for war—this holy sentiment, I ask you, is it practicable? Can it be realized? Many practical men, many public men grown old in the management of affairs, answer in the negative. But I answer with you, and I answer without hesitation, *Yes!* and I shall shortly try to prove it to you. I go still further. I do not merely say that it is capable of being put into practice, but I add, that it is *inevitable*, and that its execution is only a question of time, and may be hastened or retarded." He eulogizes Peace, the ability of man to realize it, and portrays the day when nations will be blended in harmony, battle-fields will no longer exist, bullets and bombshells will be displaced by arbitration, and cannon will be exhibited as a curiosity of former torture, declaring : "Nor is it necessary that four hundred years should pass away for that day to come." At the close of the Congress, he bursts forth : "Dare now to deny progress! But, know this well, the man who denies progress is *a monster of impiety:* the man who denies progress denies Providence, for Providence and progress is only one of the human names of the Eternal God." (See "Prize Essays on the Peace Congress" in the *North Brit. Review*, Nov. 1851.) At this same Congress, "In answer to the presumptuous declaration that Peace is impossible, M. Coquerel asserted that nothing is impossible but that which is false, which is wicked, which is antihuman, and antichristian. But everything that is true and good, everything that is Christian and divine, is possible ; if it were not so, we could do nothing but despair ; the way of progress would be closed forever to man ; and to sum up all in one word, man would be no longer man, and God no longer God." Sir David Brewster says at another Congress in England, 1851 : "If the sure word of prophecy has told us that the time must come when men shall learn the art of war no more, it is doubtless our duty, and it shall be our work, to hasten its fulfilment, and upon the anvil of Christian truth, and with the brawny arm of indignant reason, to beat the sword into the ploughshare and the spear into the pruning-hook," etc., etc. All this is simply *a perversion* of prophecy, ascribing to man what alone will be performed *by Christ*. Eminent men, by isolating prediction, and disconnecting it from the order of fulfilment given by God's Spirit, thus express sentiments (applauded and admired by the unthinking) *contradictory* to the truth. The "presumption" is theirs to deny *the scriptural delineation* of a fearful future to come, of a continued wickedness and antichristian spirit, which is to culminate in persecution and dreadful war.

[39] Indeed, so great is the desire to increase this wealth, that the highest talent and ability is invoked to devise means and plans by which money can be gained, endowments, etc., enlarged. In many, instead of "love for His appearing," love of money is the ruling passion, and projects are devised which exclude any reference whatever to the commanded position of watching. Vast sums are placed on interest, and the latter alone is used, thus keeping a hoard of wealth to eventually fall into the hands of the grasping

antichristian confederation. The most singular ways are employed to procure money; fairs, lotteries, shows, festivals, lectures, etc., being liberally utilized. Recently a printed circular has gone the rounds of the papers, urging churches to "buy cheap lands in the West, and start colonies, reserving sections," and thus profit by the subsequent increase in the value of lands thus secured. Thus real estate speculations, investments in stocks, etc., is, according to the ideas of some, *an astonishing proof* of the progress of the Christian Church toward the Millennium. We read the Bible, and understand its teaching, as *condemnatory* of such a spirit. Many are retained in the churches on account of their wealth, who are morally unfit, because their money, and gifts, and position give influence. "Is he rich?"—this is a question, when affirmatively answered, that covers a multitude of sins.

[40] The protests of Land tenantry, Socialism, Communism, Nihilism, etc., speak for themselves, for however we may object to the principles of reform advocated, the oppression and necessities give abundant reason in behalf of the same. The conflicts between capital and labor, the fearful increase of pauperism in city and country at the side of an increased material prosperity, the immense and increasing landed estates falling into the possession of a few to the detriment of the many, are subjects that have profoundly agitated statesmen. The organization of Capital in self-protection, and the organization of Labor to resist encroachments; the vast wealth secured by the labor of others (who remain poor), and the numerous strikes of laborers to increase, if possible, their wages; the ferment going on in our business centres and the periods of depression when but little employment is afforded, all indicate the danger that threatens all countries. Zech. 8 : 10 will again be largely verified in the experience of multitudes. In this connection, we refer to one fact, viz., the utilization by Capital of machinery. A number of eminent writers and statesmen are discussing the tremendous influx of manual labor-saving machinery, and the impression made upon cautious minds is, that these esteemed blessings may finally so culminate as to bring in a whirlwind of distress and sorrow by reducing the cost of labor and throwing out of employment tens of thousands through the substitution of steam, iron, and steel. This already is done on a small scale, when manufactories, owing to a manufacture beyond the market, shut down for a time to await a returning demand—a condition which is on the increase. Men are beginning to fear the final result, and anxiously canvass the expediency of urging agricultural pursuits, etc., in order to provide some means of escape, and to furnish, at least, bread. This entire labor question is so gigantic and involved, both Capital and Labor having rights that ought to be respected, that we feel incompetent to hazard an opinion, and hence merely direct attention to it as one of the signs, feeling assured that the predicted selfishness of the last times will make it an important factor in the misery entailed upon the nations.

[41] These gatherings for mutual encouragement and sympathy, have been made the subject of ridicule by the secular, and professed religious press. Infidel and Church-member, the learned and ignorant, a multitude of all classes and opinions, expressed their *scorn and contempt* of those who could thus testify to "the Blessed Hope." The notice that these have received, has been amply sufficient to indicate that their testimony is *a sign* of "the last days." In addition, another sign, that of Isa. 66 : 5, appears in connection with this one, viz., the hatred manifested, the threats employed, the epithets used toward such believers. The spirit of Luke 12 : 45 is exhibited on all sides, and many a believer feels in his person, influence, preferment, reputation, church relationship, etc., the inflictions of professed "fellow-servants" who say in their heart, and boldly proclaim it also "*my Lord delayeth His Coming.*" Persecution, under various forms, has been used, and the hearts of many are hostile and bitter against us, because we express faith and hope in the nearness of a Coming, loving Saviour. The writer's heart has been saddened and pained by bitter experience in this direction, but likewise encouraged and strengthened because divinely forewarned in the Word that such trial is to be expected.

[42] This point will again be noticed under Prop. 199. The main point of attack and defence between unbelief and faith, is the Person of the Christ. Rev. Dr. Wynn in a recent address to the Theol. Alumni of Wittenberg College, June, 1881, emphasized the fact that the great object of sceptical attack was the Coming of Jesus in the flesh, the union of the divine and human in His Person.

[43] The publication and circulation of the Scriptures within a few years has been marvellous; the issue of commentaries on the whole Bible or separate books has been unexampled; works on hermeneutics, criticism, philology, antiquities, history, geography, chronology, dictionaries, doctrines, evidences, etc., pertaining to the Bible form an immense array. Not merely faith in God's Word brings forth such fruitage, but unbelief

has recently published and circulated its tens of thousands of books and millions of tracts, attacking and criticising the Scriptures, thus, while unfriendly and evil-minded, directing attenion to them. The reader is also directed to a new and interesting study of the constellations in their Christian teaching, as presented by Rev. Dr. Seiss in his lately published work "The Gospel in the Stars." The union of teaching with the Scriptures, relating to Redemption in Christ, is wonderful.

44 The writings of Murray, Boynton, Ambler, Ballou, Hammond, Post, and a host of others, are filled *with hatred* to the Church, the ministry, Gospel, etc., and ardent appeals are made for their "*final overthrow and extinction.*" The cry of many is "Down with the Churches," and the *Telegraph* (No. 8) asserts in view of the extended and increasing unbelief: "This is the commencement of the Millennium, and it will be established *on the ruins of all the churches.*" Even women participate, as e.g. the *N. Y. Tribune* (Feb. 27, 1878) refers to a female Socialist Congress, held at Berlin, in which the *animus* of the sex under the influence of unbelief is fully exhibited, "exhorting humanity to revolt *en masse* against ecclesiastical restraints *and every form* of Christianity." Thus "Frau Hahn cried with a loud voice that the Christian Church, deformed as it is by immoral ignorance, must be *despoiled* of its trophies and possessions"--advocating the turning out of the ministry, the removal and selling of fixtures, the transformation of church property into dwelling-places and cheap lodging-houses, etc. The hostility of infidelity is something fearful to contemplate. Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 382) truthfully remarks: "The respectable people who attend preaching do not seem to know that they are saun tering in their gay clothing to the House of God over *a slumbering volcano.* If they felt sufficient interest, and took the slightest pains to inquire into the moral condition of the rough-clad and rough-handed workingmen, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population, they would be astounded, and perhaps alarmed to discover *how fierce and sullen* is the infidelity which sleeps like a tiger in the bosoms of thousands around them, and how rapid has been the spread throughout Christendom of Communism that may burst forth at any moment in a wilder conflagration than that which destroyed Paris." The *Cin. Daily Times* (March 11th, 1880) asks "What is Nihilism?" and says that, "In a speech made at Geneva in 1868, Michael Bukunin, who has been called the father of Nihilism, asserted: 'The first duty of mankind, is to obliterate from the heart any belief in a God, who is but the personification of *absolute tyranny* invented with the idea that nine tenths of the world should be subject to the remaining tenth. Tear out of your hearts the belief in the existence of God, for as long as an atom of that *superstition* remains you will never know what freedom is. The second lie is *right. Might* invented the fiction of *right*, in order to insure her reign. When you have freed your mind *from the fear of God*, and that childish respect *for the fiction of right*, then all the remaining chains which bind you, and are called science, civilization, property, marriage, morality and justice, will snap asunder like threads. *Let your own happiness be your own law.*'" These views are extremely ultra and destructive and pertain to the extremists, but even the more moderate advocate sentiments which, in the hands of the multitude that desire to be freed from moral restraint, become highly dangerous in their tendencies. When e.g. Frothingham (Introd. to *Freedom and Fellowship*) declares, "The devout intelligence of modern times does demand precisely this--*the indefinite modification* of theology; and it will press the demand until *every vestige* of the theology is swept away, and reason is alone and supreme in the domain of truth"—this is only paving the way for persecution. When Victor Hugo and the multitude of "illuminated literati" celebrate the centenary of Voltaire, and when at Geneva the centenary of J. J. Rousseau is observed, and when special honor is paid to the memory of Tom Paine, etc., these are only exhibitions of the feeling of antagonism. Prof. Bowen (Pref. to *Modern Philosophy*), in reviewing the tendencies of the times, says: "Let me be permitted also to repeat the opinion, which I ventured to express as far back as 1849, that the time seems to have arrived for a more practical and immediate verification than the world has ever yet witnessed of the great truth, that the civilization which is not based on Christianity *is big with the elements of its own destruction.*" As to the widening influence and extent of infidelity, Van Oosterzee (*Luth. Observer*, Dec. 19th, 1879) declares "that a wave of infidelity was steadily advancing over Protestant Europe, which not even the most favored country could escape," etc. Pressense (Pref. to *Early Years of Christianity*), remarks of the extension of unbelief: "It is present in the very air we breathe; it finds its way into the lightest publications; the novel and the journal vie with each other in its diffusion; short review articles, skilled in giving grace and piquancy to erudition furnish it with arguments that appear weighty because they are so in comparison with the pleasantries of Voltaire. Such a condition of things is *critical*, and calls for *grave*

and special consideration. If those who are convinced of the divinity of Christianity slumber on in false and fatal security, they must be prepared *to pay dearly* for their slothfulness ; and the Church and mankind—which have need of each other—will *pay dearly* for it also. The voice of scepticism will alone be heard, and the sweeping assertions of an unbelief—often more credulous than bigotry—will pass for axioms." A multitude of similar utterances and warnings, from men of all classes (who have no sympathy with Pre-Millenarianism), might be adduced, and the tendencies (as e.g. in the new creed of Strauss called by some "inhuman Prussianism," the "Moral Reform of France," by Renan. the "Origin and Development of Religious Belief," by Baring-Gould, the "Lectures" of Col. Ingersoll, the articles of the *Fortnightly Review*, *Popular Science Monthly*, etc., the blasphemous writings of Profs. Clifford, Greg, Morley, Stephen, and, literally, a host of others), at work presented, but we content ourselves with producing the views and spirit of two writers, illustrative of the many. In the *North Brit. Review* (Sep. 1879) is an art. "Confessions of an Agnostic," in which are loud boasts of the general unbelief prevailing ; of eminent men falling away from belief in the Supernatural ; of an intellectual development showing that "*all religion must disappear* ;" of a present "turmoil" which "will end in a settled state of confirmed unbelief ;" of colleges, universities, periodicals, works of history, fiction, etc., being largely leavened ; of science, philosophy, etc., sustaining the attacks of infidelity, and concludes, that the freedom he seeks must be obtained *by effectually crushing all enemies*. (This man, as evidence of consistency to principles, avows in the same art., that he lives with a mistress with whom he has had several children, and refused her pleading—when softened by his illness—for a marriage, because he had "*the courage*" to reject "a legal bond"). Goldwin Smith in "The Prospect of a Moral Interregnum" (*Atlantic Monthly*, Nov. 1879) after dilating on the universal unbelief, concludes as follows : "The object of this short paper is only to call attention to the fact that, if we may judge by the experience of history, a crisis in the moral sphere, which will probably bring with it *a political and social crisis*, appears to have arrived." The same writer in an art. "The Proposed Substitutes for Religion" (*Eclectic Mag.*, 1878, taken from Macmillan's), speaks of *a fearful crisis at hand*. After giving the success of destructive criticism, unbelieving science, etc., he is forced (unbelieving as he is) to add : "But at the same time the foundations of general morality have inevitably been shaken, and a *crisis* has been brought on, *the gravity* of which no one can fail to see, and nobody but a fanatic of materialism can see without *the most serious misgiving*. There has been nothing in the history of man like the present situation. The decadence of the ancient mythologies is very far from affording a parallel. The connection of those mythologies with morality was comparatively slight. Dull and half-animal minds would hardly be conscious of the change which was partly veiled from them by the continuance of ritual and state creeds ; while in the minds of Plato and Marcus Aurelius it made place for the development of a moral religion. The Reformation was a tremendous earthquake ; it shook down the fabric of mediæval religion, and, as a consequence of the disturbance in the religious sphere, filled the world with revolutions and wars. But it left the authority of the Bible unshaken, and men might feel that the destructive process had its limit, and that adamant was still beneath their feet. But a world which is intellectually and keenly alive to the significance of these questions, reading all that is written about them with almost passionate avidity, finds itself brought to *a crisis, the character of which any one may realize by distinctly presenting to himself the idea of existence without a God.*"

[45] Thus, e.g. the *Ch. Herald* (Jan. 30th, 1879) reports that "the Spiritualists boldly assert that in 'the coming regeneration,' the present state of society, and all existing creeds and religions, will be swept away by *a personage* whom they call the '*Comforter*,' who is shortly to appear in order to heal the wounds of our afflicted race." It also gives in detail the statements of a medium respecting the introduction, by Spiritualism, of "the great Day of Jubilee," "the Coming of a glorious Future—*the Coming of a New Messiah*." Numerous allusions of this kind can be quoted ; some in earnest, others, probably, of a rhetorical order. Reason itself, or Truth, is elevated to a Messiahship. Thus e.g. Rabbi Wise (*Freedom and Fellowship*, p. 380), says : "Reason, the understanding, is the Guide which God has given us ; the highest and last arbiter in all matters, human and divine. Reason is the supreme authority ; and there is no appeal from its decisions. Faith, conscience, history, and the Bible, must submit to reason," etc., and then tells us : "Truth is *the only Messiah*. Reason, says a Jewish authority, is the angel (the mediator) which stands between God and man. Reason has redeemed the human family from barbarism and will complete the work of Redemption." No wonder, in view of such utterances and the signs of the organization of evil, of the Messianic hopes

expressed in unbelieving mass conventions, that believers should deem the coming of Antichrist near at hand. Thus e.g. Archb. Trench in his Charge to the Clergy (Oct. 1879, quoted *Ch. Herald*, Jan. 15th, 1880) speaks, in view of the prevailing unbelief and its attacks, of the speedy development of the Antichrist: "The *Man* in whom will finally concentrate itself all the hatred of the world against the idea of a living God, the great Antichrist who is yet to be revealed, who will oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or is worshipped; even the false religions of the world, in so far as they are worships at all—acknowledgments by men of a greater than man—will be hateful to him, no less than the true. '*The Kingdom of Man is at hand*'—such will be the good tidings of great joy which he will proclaim, which his servants and forerunners are proclaiming already. What will be the end of the Kingdom of that Wicked One a sure word of prophecy has told us; but meanwhile the waves of the sea rage horribly, and it must be sorrowfully owned of the ship of the Church that it is but illy prepared to meet the storm." He adds: "A *tremendous crisis* is at hand for the Church of Christ—Universal Church—and is growing nearer and more threatening. We are indeed wrapped *already in the skirts of the Coming storm.*"

[46] The *Ency. Relig. Knowledge* gives in art. "Messiah" a number of pretended Messiah's who have appeared in the past; so also M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*. Others may be included as Mathias, the prophet of Winchester Co. N. Y., David George founder of the Davidists, Richard Brothers (died 1824—see art. Appleton's *Cyclop.*), etc. More recently we have had Isrolka (see *Nathaniel*, for Jan. and Feb. 1868) in Russia; one reported in the East, at Sana, in the Kingdom of Yeman; another spoken of in the *Fremdenblatt* (1872) as officially communicating with the Jewish congregation at Berlin; and several with but slight following in the United States. Every now and then the papers report something of the kind, but it is generally attributed rather to insanity than to imposture. Men may ridicule such claims, but the day is coming when one will utilize the same with terrible effect—the Antichrist. When Science arrays itself against Revelation; Naturalism strives to eradicate the Supernatural; Metaphysics assails the Divine; Ethics severs morality from belief; Geology scorns the cosmogony of Moses; Astronomy denies Inspiration; Criticism laughs at the Received Text; Neology introduces its myths; Pantheism and Spiritualism give us mystical interpretations; History subverts facts—when ten thousand agencies like these are at work with restless, disintegrating, reforming spirit, the way is surely paving for such a claim. Just as it was at the destruction of Jerusalem, with fanatical and enthusiastic claims forming dreadful signs, so it will be again, but only pondered by the thoughtful. Thus, e.g. such items as the following do not escape our notice: in the *Times-Star*, Aug. 1881, it is stated that Dr. St. Simon P. Munger professes to be "Christ Jesus, the second time in flesh without sin unto salvation;" and his professed mission is to select the 144,000 virgins, etc. Let this be characterized, as it deserves to be, insane folly; yet precisely such madness and delusion, and even worse, is to be manifested in the last days.

[47] We leave others to tell the sad story of a condition, which demands a heavy police force to be constantly exerted in order to protect property and life. John Ruskin in "The Lord's Prayer and the Church" (*Contemp. Review*, republished in the *Library Mag.*, Jan. 1880), speaking of the Church so lightly dealing with sin, and in many instances conniving at iniquity "by steadily preaching away the penalties of it," adds: "So that the great cities of the earth, which ought to be the places set on its hills, with the Temple of the Lord in the midst of them, to which the tribes should go up—centres to the Kingdoms and Provinces of Honor, Virtue, and the knowledge of the Law of God—*have become instead loathsome centres of fornication and covetousness*—the smoke of their sin going up in the face of heaven like the furnace of Sodom, and the pollution of it rotting and raging through the bones and the souls of the peasant people round them, as if they were each a volcano whose ashes broke out in blains upon man and beast. And in the midst of them, their freshly set up steeples ring the crowd to a weekly prayer-meeting that the rest of their lives may be pure and holy, while they have not the slightest intention of purifying and sanctifying, or changing their lives in any, the smallest, particular; and their clergy gather, each into himself, the curious dual power, and Janus-faced majesty in mischief, of the prophet that prophesies falsely, and the priest that bears rule by his means. And the people love to have it so." Such is the picture of an unbeliever, who cannot discern that amid all this corruption and perversion of the good, God has still reserved unto Himself "a remnant" of Godly, pious souls, *who mourn* at the gigantic evils surrounding them. The great cities of the earth, such as London, Paris, Berlin, New York, Brooklyn, Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, etc. etc., exhibit an exceeding low religious and moral condition. Talmage, from persolna ob-

servation in exploring the sinks of iniquity, declares that the enormity of hidden vice is such, that "the foundations of New York and Brooklyn *are struck through with rottenness,*" and that "if iniquity makes the same advancement in the next hundred years that it has in the past one hundred years, the last moral and religious influence will have perished from our cities. It is only a sum of moral subtraction and addition. The people know not the spread of this virus," etc. "I tell you, that I have explored the vaults and cellars of the city, and that, underneath all our American cities *are deathful and explosive influences* ready to be hurled off into a very earthquake of moral calamity." It does not require such an exploration to see the same sad and terrible condition. Our leading newspapers again and again have referred to the dangerous conditions, while judges, brought in constant contact, have expressed its depth and extent. Every one can see it that takes a daily paper, for the daily reports of vice and crime are constant and appalling. For the "Paganism of Paris," see the art. on, by Père Hyacinthe (*Eclectic Mag.*, for 1880, taken from the *Nineteenth Cent.*). Dr. Thompson in art. "Drift of Europe" (*Princeton Review*, 1878, p. 753), who is disposed to take a flattering view of the ultimate future, however, candidly remarks on the increase of infidelity and religious indifference: "In the city of Berlin, with a population of *a million* of souls, there are barely *seventy* houses of worship, including Jewish synagogues as well as Protestant and Catholic churches, chapels, and suburban stations; and, excepting on the days of church festivals, the majority of these churches *are seldom half filled.*" We have in another place had reference to "the City of Churches," Brooklyn, showing its condition made by the ministers of the place, so that we are not surprised that recent N. Y. papers say that the police records of the city indicate an increase of arrests and crime. Take Cincinnati's statistics as given by Rev. Wendle (the *Journal and Messenger*, Nov. 15th, 1878), and the population is 250,000; of these 65,000 are Roman Catholics, 7000 Jews, 20,000 foreign Protestants, making 92,000; add to this 12,000 for English Protestant churches of all classes, yet it leaves—aside from the merely nominal religious, of which there is a large class—*a fearful number* under no religious influence whatever. Mr. Wendle was not wrong when he attributed such a preponderance on the side of irreligion, when he said that "it lies in the sceptical unrest and unbelief peculiar to the age that we live in." Similar statistics are given of St. Louis, Chicago, and other cities, and the general lamentation (as we have shown elsewhere) is, that the sittings already provided are not utilized, unless on exceptional times. Such illustrations could be multiplied, and we append another to indicate that this state is attracting special attention. Under the heading "Decline of Religion in Cities," the *Lutheran Evangelist* (Nov. 22, 1878) refers to a large meeting held in the Philharmonic Hall, London, presided over by Mr. S. Morley, M. P., in which was presented as a startling fact, that "the great feature of the present day was *a growing indisposition* to attend public worship." Mr. Morley "held London to be one of *the most heathenish* parts of her Majesty's dominions. It was considered that if 58 per cent of the people were anxious to attend the churches and chapels Sunday morning there would be required 1,000,000 *more sittings*, than were provided. The most appalling statement, full of discouragement, connected with that fact, was this: that of the sittings provided, *not more than one half were occupied.*" This lamentation has come up from various cities, that ought—if the theory of progress so current is true, or if the perversion of the parable of the leaven so extensively made is correct—to be *models* of Christianity. But the fact that these great centres of influence and power are so corrupt and irreligious, that Christianity is utterly unable to stem the swollen and incoming tide, forbodes—if we accept of the significant sign—*the dreadful Coming storm* concerning which prophecy writes and warns. The *Presbyterian* (July 23d, 1881) contains a flattering account of "relative increase," viz., by taking all professing Christians (nominal, etc.) it makes the increase much greater proportionately than that of population. But any one who confronts himself with such a comparison, overlooks the tremendous emigration which swells such a contrast by its multitude of *nominal* Christians. In the same paper, occurs this pregnant fact: "The Rev. Charles H. Spurgeon took occasion in a recent sermon to urge the necessity for evangelistic work in London, which, he said, was getting to be *the most heathenish city under the sun.*" Such statements outweigh all such *delusive* contrasts. The *Lutheran Observer* of July 29th, 1881, declares of the churches of Berlin: "The German imperial city has only sixty-six Protestant churches, capable of seating but *six per cent of the population.*" We very much doubt, if we are to credit other statements made, whether these churches are *all Protestant;* for some are liberal, others infidel, and others belong to unorthodox bodies.

[48] Look at the boasts of unbelief in this direction, which, in part, we have quoted. Behold the practical results of such education separated from religion in the general un-

belief prevailing in Germany. See how boards, colleges, universities, and schools are leavened with the spirit of infidelity. Observe how school books are becoming infused with the deadly posion ; how scientific unbelief is openly taught ; how the teachings of unbelieving philosophy, metaphysics, etc., are profusely extended ; how teachers impregnated with Socialism, or Spiritualism, or Pantheism, or Naturalism, or Humanitarianism, etc., are in leading positions ; how literary and scientific lectures are presented by this class, utterly subversive of religion and morals, and do we not see *the danger* before us—that education—the boasted medium of progress and Millennial splendor—is fast falling into the hands of unbelief, and becoming instrumental in developing the mind and heart which is to introduce Antichrist. A thousand significant tokens bespeak the fatal mistake that Protestantism (Roman Catholicism was more wise and prudent, as a matter of *mere policy*) made when it gave up the education of its children *to the State without the Bible.* Such a policy would answer, provided we were assured of the proper Christian class of teachers, but when infidelity sends forth its thousands of unbelieving teachers to take possession of the land to destroy the very foundation of Christian belief, what can the righteous do? Our forefathers—"old fogies" though they were—were wiser in their day, when at the side of each church they established *a parochial school,* resting thus assured that no infidel teachers could come in to leaven the children with unbelieving notions of a non-personality of God, a non-divinity of Jesus, a non-infallibility of the Bible, a non-divine government, etc., etc. The majority rules, and when infidelity feels itself in the majority it will override all Christian objection and evidence its spirit. This is now exhibited. Thus e.g. "A year ago (*Christian Union,* Aug. 28th, 1878) the School Board of Chicago ordered the words 'God' and 'Christ' to be stricken out of the school readers, and this year (1878) they refused to reinstate them." How the Bible, the New. Test., and selections of the Scriptures (although heathen and civilized of all other descriptions are allowed) have been removed from the schools, is too well known to require special mention. The idea of separating education of the young from religion is more than heathenish (e.g. the Greeks, Romans, etc., never dreamed of such irreligion) ; it is already antichristian in spirit and tendency. Its fruits are already sufficiently evidenced in the increased unbelief among the young ; the avidity with which unbelieving and demoralizing literature is published, circulated, and read ; in the projection and pursuit of Naturalistic and Humanitarian schemes ; in the extension of worldliness, desire of wealth, love of gayety, grasping after power, public conventions to advocate the most ultra principles, depraving influences and agents, vitiating literature, etc. The truth is, that intelligence without Christianity, learning without love to God, education without religious basis, *adds strength and enlarged capacity to do evil.* As we sow, so shall we also reap ; sow without Christianity, and we shall reap without Christianity, and the harvest *immensely exceeds* the seed sown. Sow the wind of irreligion, false doctrine, etc., and, sooner or later, comes the whirlwind. We call attention even to the concessions of persons outside of the Church. Thus e.g. the editor of Scribner's *Monthly* (Vol. 16, p. 432) in an art. "Culture and Christianity," truthfully and forcibly shows that intelligence, devotion to science and culture, the highest artistic development, cannot purify, restrain selfishness, elevate morality, exalt virtue, without religion. A study of the past and the present, of eminent men of the highest attainments with depraved hearts and lives, confirms the Bible teaching on this point ; religion and religion alone, can elevate the moral nature and character, and preserve it from the selfishness and vices into which all others—with exceptional cases—so largely enter. Our system of irreligious, secular education is furnishing the vast army of unbelieving writers, lecturers, organizers, etc., which array themselves against God and His Christ, the Bible and believers, being furnished with the mental capabilities and furniture requisite for the destructive work. As a manifestation of irony and art, even Christian phraseology is adapted (as e.g. Savage in *Christianity the Science of Manhood,* and *The Religion of Evolution,* etc.) to make such unbelieving teaching the more palatable and deceptive, so that others may substitute the God of nature for the God of the Bible. So great is the leaven working that Fowle (*Contemp. Review,* Aug. 1872) not satisfied with the yielding of the Church to have her strength shorn, accuses the Church of fatally retrograding by arrogant power (i.e. by not conceding more still and ceasing her protests), and then adds by way of apology : "And then we wonder that religion is discredited in an age of positive thought, and fall to and abuse the Rationalist or the Sceptic as the author of that dark cloud of suspicion and doubt which is descending upon the world, so that all hearts 'begin to gather blackness.'" There is force in this sharp accusation, for the Church *is largely to blame,* by its connivance with worldly and secular schemes (as in education), in the training up and developing of unbelief. The *Pop. Science Monthly*

repeatedly censures the Church for not being still more meek and submissive to the course of popular and scientific education. Numerous periodicals regard the secular system as the very best possible provision to extend, at the least expense and labor, the principles of unbelief. Even those who profess to occupy a middle ground (making themselves large and dangerous concessions) find fault with Christian educators that they are not sufficiently liberal; while hundreds are fondly anticipating a cordial union and agreement with the modern phrases of unbelieving thought, which becomes "a snare and delusion." What union or fellowship is there e.g. between Christianity and Strauss's *New Faith* ("We believe in no God, but only in a self-poised, and amid eternal changes, constant Universum!") or Huxley's, or Mill's, or ten thousand others' expressed belief? None; the latter lead our young men and women, our boys and girls, on and on to the culminated Antichrist. This God's Spirit predicts, and we believe it, especially when the means and instrumentalities for doing the same are to-day present at work. We thank God, that so many noble men still stand firm in behalf of Christian education and Christian science, and thus resist the encroachments of unbelief.

[49] The ignoring or spiritualizing of it by the many, the perversive application of that which belongs to the future, to the past, and the present; the wholesale appropriation or denunciation of it; the scoffing and sneering heaped upon it—of which we give numerous instances—all indicate a condition such as must, if the prophetic portraiture of the times is fully met, exist previous to the end, and the nearer we come to the end, the more will it be developed. Is it not true that recently more books have been published in this direction, than all the preceding centuries have brought forth.

[50] Some of the Jewish Rabbis give special signs as preceding the sudden Advent of the Messiah, and among them are such as the New Test. assigns to the Sec. Advent. Thus e.g. those quoted in art. "Messiah" in Herzog's *Cyclop.*, of which we give the following extract: R. Jochanan (Bab. Sauh. f. 96—Ugol. 25, 954) says, "The Son of David comes not, until the Denunciator defends himself; also, until the disciples are few in number; also, until money disappears from the purse; also, until man doubts concerning Redemption." Thus wickedness, unbelief, poverty, and infidelity are characterized. So even the Mohammedans (art. on M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*), give a variety of signs, chiefly drawn from the Jewish Talmud and Midrash.

[51] The reader scarcely needs to be reminded that Luther, Melanchthon, Latimer, and many prophetical writers, believed that the time would be shortened. Numerous writers of marked ability contend for the suddenness of the Advent, its impending imminency, but weaken their language (and even raise an antagonism) by not observing the difference between the first and last stage of the Sec. Advent (see e.g. Prop. 130). Thus to illustrate: Buck (*Harm. and Exp.* of *Matt.* 24) exhorts to constant watchfulness and preparation, etc., but vitiates his own properly given cautions (even while correctly censuring the fixing of an exact positive time for such coming, as opposed to the posture of watching—by intervening certain events as e.g. "it will not take place before the Jews have re-possessed Jerusalem, and the nations of the earth meet for the conflict against Israel, Zech. 14." He thus directs attention *to the last stage* of the Advent (the open Parousia of Jesus *with* His saints) and *not* (as he should do) *to the first stage* (the thief-like Parousia of Jesus *for* His saints). Having specially called attention to this feature, we need not repeat reasons already given.

[52] When the Spirit of God gives us the signs; when Jesus urges us to their observance; when the Word declares that they are significant of nearness; when eminent men like Mede, the Newtons, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Olshausen, Bengel, Bickersteth, and a thousand others call attention to the signs and urge them as indicative of nearness, certainly it ill becomes any believer to close his eyes, mind, and heart to them. Let unbelief avoid them; let infidelity deride them; let lukewarmness turn away from them with unfriendly spirit, yet Abrahamic faith and love for His appearing will constantly, in view of them, hold what Paul says in Rom. 13 : 11, 12. Having used this last passage before, we, to substantiate our reference, quote as illustrative, two authorities. Dr. Brown (*Com. loci*) says: "'For now is our salvation'—rather 'the salvation,' or simply 'salvation'—'nearer than when we (first) believed.' This is in the line of all our Lord's teaching, which represents *the decisive day of Christ's second appearing as at hand*, to keep believers ever in the attitude of wakeful expectancy, but without reference to the chronological nearness or distance of that event. 'The night (of evil) is far spent, the day (of consummated triumph over it) is at hand.'" (Comp. Lange, Olshausen, DeWette, Phillippi, Meyer, and others, who hold to such a reference as only tenable.) Alford observes: "A fair exegesis of this passage can hardly fail to recognize the fact, that the apostle here, as well as elsewhere (1 Thess. 4 : 17; 1 Cor. 15 : 51) speaks of the Coming of the

Lord as rapidly approaching" (see his references). We add: the Jewish usage of "salvation," and its use in the Scripture (as e.g. Isa. 25 : 9 ; Heb. 9 : 28, etc.) is in itself sufficient to sustain our interpretation and application of the passage.

Obs. 4. Now we come to consider, in the briefest manner, the signs which *follow* the first stage of the Advent, and which being more particularly confined to a distinctive *interval*, and embracing *far greater ones* will be *readily recognized* by all the believing children of God. 1. The *first sign* indicative of the Coming open manifestation of the Son of Man will be the Translation of living saints (Prop. 130) in connection with a secret resurrection of saints. This will be recognized by many as a sad (to them that must remain to endure tribulation), but still joyful (because verifying approaching deliverance) sign of a Saviour *already present and observant* of the interests of His own.[1] 2. While this is recognized by those who accept of God's Word, and leads to a correspondent recognition and assertion of the Advent, *the denial* of such an Advent will become the more emphatic and ardent over the world. "*Where is the promise of His Coming,*" will proceed from multitudes of "scoffers" to neutralize the effects of what has taken place. 3. Notwithstanding the opposition and bitterness of unbelief, we are assured in Rev. 14, that *after* the removal of the symbolical number 144,000, there will be resulting from the given signs, *a specific preaching* over the earth of two messages most appropriate for the times, viz. the proclamation to "*fear God and give glory to Him, for the hour of His judgment is come,*" and in view of the incoming worship of Antichrist, "*and worship Him that made heaven,*" etc. This will be *a simultaneous, powerful preaching* preparing the Church for the terrible Antichristian struggle before her, and with such success that "*a multitude*" shall pass through the great tribulation, willingly sacrificing life rather than yield up faith and hope in the Christ, Rev. 8 : 9, 14 and 20 : 4.[2] 4. While this energetic work of the Church, now *fully recognizing* her chronological position, and that the time is short, is going on, at the same period, *increase of corruption* in all the varied forms previously described will be experienced ; the perilous times will become more perilous ; the characters delineated will become more and more determined in their hostility to the good ; human efforts at regeneration will be more boldly proclaimed and accepted at the side of a witnessing Gospel. The moral and religious signs, given under the previous Observation, will become *more sharply defined and intensified.* 5. Without giving the order of events, we notice next, the rise of *the last great Antichrist* and the formation of *a confederation* of nations under him, Prop. 160, 161, etc. 6. The *fall of Babylon* under his influence and power, which includes the Papacy and all State Churches, as well as all Hierarchical institutions ; the hatred of the Antichrist even finally extending to all ecclesiastical organizations that professedly or otherwise favor Christ. We need not enter into the mooted question how much is comprehended under the term "Babylon," and what is meant by "her daughters," because in the ruin of Babylon herself, that of "her daughters," whoever they may be, as well as that of the overthrow ecclesiastically (i.e. as outwardly organized) of the Churches will also be affected at the same time. While the Papacy will meet her doom, State Churches, and all others will most cruelly suffer at the hands of the Antichristian Confederation. The former, however, preceding the latter in point of time. 7. For, after the downfall of Babylon, Rev. 14 :

9–13, comes *the fearful persecution* of all true believers and their heroic martyrdom, Prop. 161 and 162. The demand made for worship will be a sign so striking and particularized in fulfilment, that it will be unmistakable to the believing. The requirement to worship the beast and his image, will be withstood by faithful souls whom God will *also honor* for a triumphant exhibition of faith. The "wise then will understand" and wisdom will preserve them indomitable. 8. An astonishing sign will be a return *to idol worship*. Even now the Pantheistic, Naturalistic current is sweeping in this direction, and no doubt to meet the fulfilment, the plea will be made, that worship will be aided in the masses by and through material objects, and that in such an outward expression the adherents of the new faith will be known. Men may now sneer at this as ridiculous, but even hatred to Christ is sufficient, when the time comes, to introduce it as *a test and the most certain method* by which to make the weak succumb and place themselves in a positive unchristian attitude. The alarming reintroduction of heathen doctrine and leaning upon Naturalism, even already makes thoughtful men see the entering wedge by which this can be effected in the laying down and advocacy of principles that naturally develop the idea.[3] One thing is certain, let men acknowledge it or not, that *it is predicted* (as e.g. Rev. 13 : 4, 14–17 and 9 : 20, 21, etc.) to take place before the last stage of the Advent. The *degradation* of humanity, after all its boasted enlightenment, after all its vaunted efforts at regeneration, shall be manifested (as in the French Revolution) in a pitiful return *to heathenism* somewhat refined under modern Pantheistic manipulations. Forsaking the God of the Bible for Nature, it partakes the nature of a just retribution. 9. A sign which the student ponders with a feeling of awe, because of the influence for destruction that it will exert over multitudes, weak and credulous enough to be entrapped by it, is *the performance of miracles, the exercise of miraculous powers* as stated, e.g. Rev. 13 : 13, 14, and 16 : 14, and 19 : 20. 2 Thess. 2 : 9, etc. It appears a just punishment that unbelief now so bitterly opposed to Revelation because of its connection with the Supernatural and miraculous, should at the time of the end, to secure its supposed victory over Christianity, lay hold of and exhibit to the admiration of its hosts "*signs and lying wonders.*" What these miracles consist in, that period must determine ; the outlines of some of them are sufficiently given to make them recognizable when they are proposed for acceptance. Even now the leaven may, for aught we know, be creeping in, if we are to credit one half that Spiritualism gives us now of wonders performed by their distinguished mediums, and which many distinguished men profess themselves unable to explain. Let the present indications in this direction be what they may, it is revealed, that when the set time has come, the nations of the earth will be wofully *deceived* by pretended miraculous power, given evidently as proof (now declared by many to be impossible) of the correctness of their faith. It is a wonderful ordering, that the line of final punishment comes in that of long continued previous denial.[4] 10. The *restoration* of a portion of the Jews to Palestine, whom Antichrist *will attack and overwhelm*, is a significant sign. The condition of the Jews and of Jerusalem at that time—which implies also the previous loss or grant of Palestine by Turkey—will be carefully noted by the believing that may be spared. 11. The *wars* of the Antichristian power, its *success*, its *march* to the Holy Land, etc., will all find their mates in prophecy and be thus signs, one following the other,

of the rapidly approaching catastrophe. 12. But even before this, *the unsettled condition* of nations, their *perplexity, distress,* etc., preparatory to their confederated capacity must be witnessed, and all those commotions, revolutionary movements, the preliminary overthrowing of thrones, etc., will meet with corresponding awakened interest in the mind of the prophetic student. 13. Before, probably but a very short time before, the open Revelation of Jesus with His saints in behalf of the Jewish nation (Zech. 14), *Elijah the Prophet* will be sent to the Jews as predicted (Mal. 4 : 5, 6), being unto them a forerunner as John the Baptist at the First Advent—comp. Prop. on Antichrist. The early Church (as e.g. Justin in Dial. with Trypho.) and many teachers have correctly held to this coming of Elijah before the Second Advent, but more definitely it pertains *to this stage* of it, and is designed only for the Jewish nation.[5] 14. For the reasons already given, *nature* may be expected now to greatly increase her signs. In comparison of Scripture, the student will become impressed with the idea of Oosterzee (*Theol. of N. Test.*) that the Sec. Advent will be ushered in with impressive signs, accompanied with stupendous changes in the cosmical and moral spheres. Whatever of figure may be connected with the description of these last times, yet the past belief that nature itself will sympathize in the last great struggle by the giving forth of terrific tokens in violent earthquakes, etc., is one that commends itself as *eminently suitable* for those who have again returned to *nature's worshippers.* That which they esteem their god, shall be employed against them ; so that event after event, in the heavens above and in the earth beneath, shall occur which unbelieving science, with all its inflation, shall be unable to recognize and explain as the result of natural law. The curse will press the more heavily ; groaning creation nearing deliverance will, as tokens, enter upon her last throes, as if acknowledging the secret presence of her King and Liberator.[6] 15. Then, too, will appear the sign of the Son of Man following, and perhaps in some way connected with, the translation, etc., either at its occurrence or afterward at Sinai. If it takes place shortly before the open Revelation and not in the way suggested (Prop. 130), as related to the removal of the saints, or to their appearance in clouds, etc., afterward, then it may, probably, refer to some such sign as Amos 8 : 9 ; or Joel 3 : 15 ; or 2 : 31, etc. Whatever it is, for at present we can only conjecture, it will be found so significantly predicted in the Word that there will be no difficulty in recognizing it in fulfilment as a sign of the Christ.[7] 16. Other signs are found scattered here and there, which will then be duly considered by the faithful, such as the formation of a confederacy, *a great contest* by Antichrist and his hosts with some other power preliminary to the final one with Christ and His army ; the union of the false prophet with the Antichrist (for whatever inchoate fulfilment there may be found in the Papacy according to prophetical writers, it must be borne in mind that this prophet endures to the bitter end, is in the last battle, while the Papacy has been previously destroyed, Rev. 17 : 16) ; the incoming of certain plagues and woes, of developments and contests, the three unclean spirits, etc., all couched in figurative or symbolical language and pertaining to that period still future, so that it would be mere conjecture to attempt an elucidation of the same in the way of particularizing who or what is really designated. It is for the developments of that time of the end to bring these forth *distinctively,* when they shall be duly appreciated and mated by the observant, watching ones.[8]

[1] We cannot possibly receive the notion entertained by a small party of Separatists, under the leadership of Barbour and Russell, viz., that Jesus is already present. The mystical conception that leads to this, we meet elsewhere. For the present we only say that *a non-resurrection and non-translation* of the saints is sufficient proof to show that the Sec. Advent has *not yet* taken place, for these are inevitably and at once associated with the first stage of the Advent. Their claim of this particular presence being "spiritually discerned" is precisely equivalent to that of the Shakers, who also claim such a "spiritual discernment" of the Second Advent transpired, and even of an existing Millennium already begun.

[2] Consequently we cannot possibly receive the notion entertained by some (as e.g. partially by Lincoln's *Lects. on Rev.*, and totally by Swormstedt *The End of the World Near*, etc., etc.) that *after* the resurrection and translation, there is *no more* proclamation of the truth, no more saved, the Holy Ghost being withdrawn, etc., for this is a perversion of the order of Rev. 14, a non-recognition of the first and second stages of the same Advent, and an ignoring of *the interval and the events* connected therewith. Having referred to this in another place, we only now add : of course those who so arrogantly and selfishly apply to themselves the noble portraiture of the 144,000, and the angel messages, as is done by the Seventh-Day Adventists (under the enlightened guidance of a professed prophetess, Mrs. White) it is not surprising (as was done by one of their evangelists, Mr. Stone, at Springfield, O., July, 1878) that they should say—to sustain their *unjustifiable self-application* of noble and elevated prediction—that it is "senseless" to look for the Second Advent of Jesus to precede these angel messages. On the other hand, when Rev. Randolph (Danville *Tribune*, March 12th, 1880) says : "The time is coming, and is not far distant, when the believing Church will take, openly, the ground of Irenæus the Great, the glory of his time, and write Post-Millenarianism as a heresy against the truth of God"—we believe this, but that it will only take place *during this interval*, and *after* the resurrection and translation of a chosen body at the first stage, thief-like Coming. *When* the Church sees how it has been blinded and deluded by false hopes so eloquently expressed ; *when* she recognizes her position in the order of events and what is before her, *then* this doctrine so derided, and branded in many quarters as heretical, will be the very doctrine to raise the believer from despair ; remove despondency and darkness ; impress the divine promises and covenants ; infuse renewed faith, hope, and courage ; restore "the blessed hope," to its exalted strength-imparting position ; and nerve small and great, learned and ignorant, old and young to resist anti-christian efforts and persecution *even unto death.*

[3] We say nothing respecting the failures of a class of Spiritualists to form a human image with a vocal apparatus to be manipulated by the spirits—to serve as a sort of universal medium and direction—for a more dangerous manifestation is in the excessive laudation and glorification of nature, so prevalent in numerous books. We give a single illustration to show our meaning : when (*Mod. Doubt*, by Christlieb, p. 32) men once say : "Brahma, Buddha, Jupiter, and Jehovah must now yield to worthier successors in reason and philanthropy" (so Wichern), or, "what we want is a new Church. I am for a free stage. The theatre is my temple, where I would see inaugurated a new form of worship. The theatre should be regarded as a house of God, as it was among the ancient Greeks. Religion and the drama I would fain see identified" (so Eckardt)—then there is but a short step to a return to an idol-worship patterned after the ancient Magi, Greeks, and Romans. The worship of the "Imperial Sun" as an "all-powerful and Omnipresent Creator" is more than hinted at in that degraded and rotten work *The Masculine Cross.* In another place (Prop. 161) we introduce some who boldly advocate idol-worship.

[4] The student will observe how significantly the signs in this direction are fulfilling. While unbelief shall continue to exist, and the Supernatural of the Bible is dismissed as unallowable—expressly to break down its moral requirements, its humiliation of man, etc.—yet it is predicted that men shall, with such unbelief of Revelation, entertain a faith in the extraordinary and miraculous in their own concocted religio-infidel faith. Already thousands of intelligent but unbelieving men are forsaking the ground of Strauss (*Life of Christ*, Introd.) : "We may summarily reject all miracles, prophecies, narratives of angels and demons, and the like, as simply impossible and irreconcilable with the known and universal laws which govern the course of events," as untenable. True, indeed, in their case, so far as the Bible is concerned, but not correct as to the incoming "regeneration" or "reformation" of mankind which is to introduce an acquaintance with "higher and nobler mysteries" than were ever before divulged to man. The movement is singular and striking, and worthy of close and thoughtful attention. Such a

union of unbelief with the manifestation of the lowest credulity—of contempt for Holy Writ with the unhesitating acceptance of human teaching—of denial of Christianity with the formation of some kind of religious faith to satisfy the cravings of man's nature—is certainly most remarkable.

On the other hand, we object, as misleading and unscholarly, the application that Waggoner and Stone (Seventh-Day Adventists), and others, make of 2 Thess. 2 : 9, as if the "Coming" of Jesus took place literally "*after*" this wonder-working, because it says in our version "*after the working of Satan.*" That is, they take the word "after" to mean time, when it denotes only *likeness or resemblance,* and this they press so as to favor their theory of the Papacy, etc. Now it is true that Jesus comes openly after this extraordinary manifestation of wickedness, but He comes thief-like *before* it. This takes place during the interval. We allow Barnes (*Com. loci*) to give a correct statement as to the meaning of the passage : "The word rendered *after*, it need not be said to one who looks at the Greek, does not refer to *time*, but is a preposition, meaning *according to; in conformity with*, meaning that the manner of His appearing would be accompanied by such works as should show the agency of Satan employed, and such as he only could produce. It does not mean that the Coming of the Lord Jesus would be *after* Satan had worked in this manner, but that the manifestation of that wicked one would be with such demonstrations of power and wonder as Satan only could effect."

[5] The prophetical student will ever keep in mind that Eljiah's mission is one, not to the Gentiles, but expressly to the Jewish nation, and that down to the scene delineated in the first part of Zech. 14, he certainly has not put in his mission. His coming is *after* the first stage of the Advent of Jesus, and *after* this last tribulation of the Jews under Antichrist, for previous to this there is no conversion of the nation. We doubt not that in the darkest hour of gloom, when feeling the persecuting power of the Antichrist, and when all hope seems to have perished, Elijah, according to promise, will come, and will prepare the remnant to accept so heartily the Lord Jesus.

[6] The darkening of the sun, the moon not giving her light, the stars falling, the powers of the heaven shaken, is *immediately after* the Jewish tribulation, Matt. 24 : 29 ; Mark 13 : 24, 25 (hence the folly of making "the dark day" and "the falling of the stars" of the past these, as some do to make out a favorite date, etc.), and cannot (whatever symbolical meaning, as some hold, is connected with it) wholly be figurative, but refer to natural darkness, etc., as evidenced e.g. by the parallel passage of Joel. 2 : 30, 31, indicative (as *God Himself* will show wonders) of what took place in Egypt (Ex. 10 : 21–23), or in Palestine (Matt. 27 : 45). Such signs shall only be produced on a grander scale. D. N. Lord (*Theol. and Lit. Journal*, Oct. 1860, p. 223) takes the position (the more noticeable, since he is so strict in the application of symbolical language) that as Luke 21 : 25, 26, makes these things "*signs* in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars," such things (as the darkening of the sun, etc., mentioned by Matt. and Mark) are *to be understood literally* as "processes of which those orbs are to be the subjects, and that are to be visible to men." With this view, as we have shown, men of the highest ability coincide. We incorporate this idea, for the reasons already assigned, with its figurative import, for as men are urged on to their final rebellious attitude by a firmly expressed trust in *the unalterable* condition of nature, and openly avowed faith in "the unalterable laws ordaining ever-enduring continuance," a reverence for (while ignoring the Creator and His claims) the forces of "the Universum," it is but *just and reasonable* that God—so despised and dishonored—should give such natural signs, to bring their trust, faith, and reverence to a test, which will result, as the sure Word testifies, in inspiring "*men's heart's failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.*" They are the precursors of terror and vengeance ; they will be recognized with abject fear of coming evil and despair ; they will be regarded by others with the hope of a speedy and glorious deliverance.

[7] Some make this sign of the Son of Man to be a cross in heaven ; others, the star of the Messiah ; others, the Messiah Himself ; others, the sign mentioned in preceding context ; some, a luminous appearance ; others, the appearance of a man ; some, a Shekinah, or the glory of Christ ; others, the cloud of light that bears Him ; others, the last plagues ; others, a sword shining forth, or falling, from heaven ; some, the translation of the saints ; others, the resurrection body of Jesus. We cannot now determine ; the day will come when the believers will recognize and exult in it.

[8] Men may turn away from the prophetic picture thus drawn, declaring it impossible for human nature to manifest such depravity, especially in the way of persecuting the Church. But the spirit is in man, and even now begins its threatenings, as is evidenced by the bold language of ten thousand utterances. Having given (Props. 161–163) some

illustrations, a few more must suffice. In the *Luth. Observer*, Sep. 15th, 1876, it is stated that "a correspondent of the Boston *Investigator* proposes the enactment of a law, which he calls 'An Act to Protect the People from Religious Imposition.' It makes it a penal offence to conduct public worship, or to preach the Gospel for a compensation, on the ground that those who do so are obtaining money under false pretences." Literally multitudes would delight—as their public affirmations show—in such enactments. Take Andrew Jackson Davis, the great leader of the Spiritualists, and such is his language (comp. *Review of Bushnell*, p. 3, 187, etc.): "You may be assured of the truth of this approaching crisis. The world must recognize it, *because it will be accompanied with war;* for politics are inseparably connected, all over the world, with religious systems. Religion will develop reason; but politics will impel the masses *to unsheath the sword, and to stain the bosom of nature with blood!* Friends of Progress! be not discouraged; for the final crisis must come; then the strange interregnum." He predicts political and moral revolutions that shall overthrow both Protestantism and Catholicism, and then under the auspices of reason, Spiritualism, etc., "the children of earth will then be comparatively free and happy! for *the Millennial epoch* will have arrived!" Alas! the vanity of human predictions, and "the snare" and "the pit" they form for multitudes!

Obs. 5. Here then are the main, leading signs which precede the Coming Kingdom of God; those that pertain *to the first stage* of the Advent and its preliminary ordering at Mt. Sinai, and then those that relate *to the open manifestation* of the King at Jerusalem and the re-establishment of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, embracing also the conversion and restoration of the Jewish nation. These are the warnings that the Spirit has given, but however earnestly and faithfully presented by any one, they are unheeded by the multitude, like the warning of Lot or the preaching of Noah, and to many the believer in them (Gen. 19 : 14) "*seems as one that mocked.*" Excuses abundantly suggest themselves why they should not be regarded, but childlike Abrahamic faith sees in them *the strongest possible motives* for increased, constant watchfulness. When not only the signs preliminary to the Coming of the saints are here, but when even these throw their shadows forward into the fearful interval between the first and second stages, then indeed is it *inexcusable* to be faithless. *When*, e.g. rejecters of the Divine Plan of Redemption, under the teaching of professed spirits of the dead, give us another sustained by "signs and wonders"; *when* this is a spirit largely at work in various bodies (i.e. professing wonder-working power, revived again; also e.g. in Roman Catholicism, Mormonism, etc.); and *when* this is associated with a prevailing Naturalistic tendency, we can readily see the elements *already existing and moulding* men's minds and hearts for the wonder-working period still future. When a time of abounding demon worship, of idolatry, and of corresponding corruption, is surely coming, and if we are indeed nearing it, *then the things specified are precisely those* which ought to appear. They are present; growing too by the fostering care of many able minds into a fruitage, such as the Omniscient Spirit has portrayed. It is simply folly to close our eyes to existing facts; and the denial of them does not lessen the danger, but may greatly mislead ourselves and others. The sign that the signs themselves will be neglected is a sad one, and will not be overlooked by the wise. Calvin's remark on Luke 18 : 8 ever remains true: "Christ expressly foretells that, from His ascension to Heaven till His return, *unbelievers will abound;* meaning by these words that if the Redeemer does not speedily appear, the blame of the delay will attach to men, because there will be *almost none to look for Him.* Would that we did not behold so manifest a fulfilment of the prediction!" A positive denial of His Coming is pronounced (2 Pet. 3 : 17) to be "*the*

error of the wicked;" while a refusal to watch for His Coming or the declaration that "*my Lord delayeth His Coming,*" to say the least, is *a violation of enjoined duty.* Esteemed men of ability and usefulness, are certainly assuming *grave responsibility* in this matter, when in books, etc., they teach that Christ's Advent is not to be watched for as He commanded, but that it is still postponed for many, many long centuries, and that, instead of incoming wrath and tribulation, the Church is to anticipate triumph and continued progress. The signs given for faith do not startle them; the position assigned for watching does not move them (for they conveniently substitute death or Providence, etc.); the announcement of a sudden, unexpected Coming upon a faithless Church does not affect them; *what then will arouse them?* The event itself secretly occurring, and making itself known and felt by the removal here and there of a small minority of watching ones! *That, that* will so startle, move, and *deeply affect* them that they will proclaim, with mighty energy, *the long neglected signs* connected with a Second Advent. Brethren must not censure us for plain writing; with such views, impressed by a sense of duty and responsibility, it would be a violation of them not thus to express them. A deep interest in the welfare of others, and a sincere desire to promote the happiness of our brethren, influences us to write these things. Allow that we are mistaken; yet a consideration of honesty upon our part in giving what we hold *to be truth,* will prevent the honest from getting angry at our words. We gratefully acknowledge their intelligence, piety, and usefulness, and it only grieves us the more that *so much that is excellent* should be weighted against some of the plainest truths in the Bible. A surprising feature connected with these signs, and precisely that which ought to exist provided the injunction of constant watching is to be observed, is, that they all previous to the first stage, are of a nature observable from the early Church down to the present day. It is, therefore, doing *injustice* to believers in the past to say, that they were *credulous and foolish* to look for the Advent, seeing that they were mistaken, etc.; on the contrary, it evinces *their faith* in God's Word and *their conscientiousness* in occupying the commanded position *when beholding the signs* existing around them they believed, thus showing *love and desire for* "*the blessed hope,*" etc. Let them indeed be mistaken in their apprehension of its nearness, yet the observance of such faith, the practical results attained by it, the honoring of Christ evinced by it, the hope and prayer elicited by it, etc., will not—as little as the cup of water—*fail in its reward* at the Revelation of Jesus. The shortness of time in the Spirit's comprehension. is indeed brief; these preparatory dispensations, when compared with the eternal ages that follow, are but of short duration; and since these utterances were given, and these worthies thus believed, the length of this dispensation has been so materially shortened that *prudence* alone dictates, aside from other considerations pressed, the faith, hopes and longings inspired by these signs—thus constantly augmenting, accumulating, and becoming more and more distinctive—as ever presented by godly men who "love the appearing." Better, a thousand times better, be mistaken as to time, than to ignore those signs and be *caught faithless, unobservant, and worthy of rebuke.*

While Millenarianism is something very different from Millerism, it has often occurred to the writer that it would even be far preferable to occupy Miller's position, mistaken as it was in reference to time, to the Millennial age, etc., than to be indifferent as

multitudes of professing Christians are, both to the signs and the Advent. Mr. Miller at least *honored* Christ's Word, and however mistaken in particulars (which his followers, we are told, pressed beyond his more prudent opinions) yet the principle involved of watching for Christ's Advent is a just one, eminently scriptural, and will redound, if not now, in the age to come, to his honor. The same is true of others ; for while unable to accept of their particularizing, or of their prophetical schemes in the order laid down by them, yet the evident love and desire for "the appearing" which prompted their labors, the urgency of entreaty and warning to occupy the biblical position of watching servants, has so commended them to us, with all their faults, that we must *highly esteem* them as brethren beloved. If there is any force in the scriptural cautions and injunctions upon this point, we must believe, provided true Christian character is maintained therewith, such will stand immensely higher and nearer to the King than many, now leaders in the Church, who take a pleasure *to show off their wit and sarcasm* at others' expense. The reviling, scorning, deriding, sneering, etc., will in either case meet with its due reward. God is the Judge, and not man ; whoever *honored His Word*—feebly, brokenly it may be—will be *honored by Him.*

Obs. 6. It is to us, whatever it may prove to others, cheering evidence of the inspiration of the Word that it is so formed, that, instead of giving positive certainty as to time, it points us to signs which are calculated, *eminently so by reason of a continuous fulfilment,* to impress and lead us, if only considered, to watch. This indefinite and yet *sign impressing imminency is to us decided proof of the Divine wisdom ;* man could not —as man's failures and man's precipitancy evidence—have so presented the matter as to cause every succeeding age to respond more or less to the practically intended result, viz. to preserve, in view of a constantly recurring contingency indicated by constantly recurring witnessed signs, a constant state of vigilance. In conclusion : let the frequency with which the Spirit presents the Sec. Advent, and the signs preceding and connected with it, be regarded ; let the mighty issues related with the same bearing heavily upon the individual believer (in cautions respecting personal responsibility in watching), the Church (multitudes in it being taken unprepared and unobservant of Divine direction) and the world (scoffing at the whole subject) be contemplated ; let the happiness and reward of the watching servant, and the rebuke and loss of the unvigilant be pondered ; and surely we are *not wrong* in thus urging *all to occupy* this believing position. If the Word makes it so prominent and important ; if so much that is desirable is identified with it ; if the neglect of it is both an act of disobedience and dangerous ; if a completeness of Christian attitude and character requires it ; surely we cannot make it *less prominent and desirable.* Here then is our apology, if in the estimation of any one an excuse is needed, for holding forth upon these scriptural topics, and urging the warnings given by Christ and the apostles.

Again we urge professors of religion, believers in the Bible, to consider that, if their affections are *really fixed* on Christ—if He is all in all—this subject instead of being unwelcome ought, in virtue of their profession and love, *to be intensely interesting and desirable.* This looking for the Advent, expressive of faith, hope, love, and obedience, is described as the crowning excellence of God's gifts in 1 Cor. 1 : 7 "*so that ye come behind in no gift, waiting for the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*" (thus confirming "the testimony of Jesus" Rev. 1 : 3). On this passage Olshausen appropriately remarks : "The expectation of Christ's Coming *is a testimony of inward spiritual life,* and one of the fruits of faith ; for this 'waiting' (Rom. 8 : 9) is not a dry historical assertion of the fact that the Lord will return again one day, but the expression of *an earnest desire* for it, which is not to be conceived without love, faith, and hope, 1 Cor. 13 : 13." Barnes *loci,* says : "An earnest wish to see Him, and a confident expectation and firm belief that He will return, is *an evidence of a high state of piety.* It demands strong faith, and it will do much to elevate the feelings above the world, and to keep the mind in a state of peace."

(Comp. Prop. 182 and 183.) Dr. Seiss (the *Apoc.*, p. 35) alluding to the "peculiar efficacy and power in the doctrine of Christ's speedy return," adds: "It is the most animating and most sanctifying subject in the Bible. It is the soul's serenest light amid the darkness and trials of earth," etc.

Obs. 7. We again insist that, for the reasons already fully assigned, we should occupy *the commanded posture of expectancy*, and allow no event to intervene between us and the Advent. As Calvin declares in 1 Pet. 4 : 7 : "Moreover, it must be laid down as a first principle, that ever since the appearing of Christ, there is nothing left to the faithful, but with wakeful minds *to be always intent on His Sec. Advent.*" The signs are *all* present —not one is omitted—and it becomes us, as believers, to recognize the fact, and *correspondingly, look, watch, and pray.*

We, therefore, regard it as both unscriptural and misleading to intervene a number of events between the present and the Advent. Able writers, a large number, are engaged in this work, especially insisting upon a restoration of the Jews, etc., as preliminary, overlooking how *the interval* embraces much that they locate before the thief-like Coming. Some works have chapters entitled "Events that must Precede the Second Advent," and periodicals have articles on the same, and yet urge to a constant watching for the Advent as immediate when they give a series of events which, at least, will require quite a number of years to bring about. There is some inconsistency in this, for it may well be queried how it is possible for a man to regard the Advent as possible *at any day* when he has events to occur previously, and which he informs us "*must*" first take place. Our opponents (as Waldegrave in *New Test. Millenarianism*, Lect. 6) positively assert that the Advent cannot be imminent, because certain events (such e.g. as the preaching of the Gospel as a witness, a partial restoration of the Jewish nation, and the antichristian hosts meeting at Armageddom) must first be witnessed. So Wild (*The Lost Ten Tribes*, p. 57) hampered by his peculiar wild theory, and looking for events based upon it, to precede the Sec. Advent says: "It is, therefore, unwise on the part of any person to claim that Christ may come any day, and that his Millennial reign may be begun at any moment." The signs that *he enumerates* are precisely those which are to be realized during the interval and the Mill. age. (It is only necessary to say that Wild reproduces in England, the outrageous theories of some Americans (Berg and others), only changing the nomenclature. Thus e.g. Berg and others make the Stone of Dan. 2 to be the United States, while Wild makes it to be England (!), the two feet of the image being France and Spain (!) upon which feet England fell and pounded them (!), and will smite the whole image whose head now is Russia (!), after which England will remove her royal residence and throne to Jerusalem (!). It is a matter of amazement that such writers have a following.). Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 50) intervenes certain events, and then objects to "the impossibility of watching for Christ's Coming on the common view of it, or rather on any view of it, which does not admit of our expecting it at almost any moment," and thinks that he watches for the Sec. Advent when he discards all chronology, interposes a long series of events, and makes even the Milliage to intervene, and simply allows faith and hope to hold it as near. But *how* this juxtaposition is brought about, he does not inform us, and shelters himself by quoting men who did not hold his (the Whitbyan) view, but the Augustinian theory. Alas! many such writers could be quoted. On the other hand, it is gratifying to find so many who, discerning the indefiniteness as to time, or the stages and interval, occupy the scriptural position, and urge it. Dr. Kellogg, in a paper presented to the Convention in Dr. Tyng's church, in New York, quotes Archb. Trench (*On the Parables*) as saying: "It is a necessary element of the doctrine concerning the Sec. Coming of Christ, that it should *be possible at any time*, that no generation of believers should regard it as impossible in theirs," and then, after urging the scriptural attitude of constant watching, the Dr. adds: "Inasmuch, therefore, as no candid person will deny that the Lord does command His disciples in all ages to watch for His Coming, it follows irresistibly that the Lord intended that we should think of His Advent *as always possible*, and forbids us to interpose any such fixed period of time between us and His Coming, as shall make it impossible for us to believe *that He may come in our day.*" Dr. Brookes (the *Truth*, vol. 4, p. 117) quotes Trench as above, and then adds these two: Augustine saying: "The last day is unknown, that *every day*, may be observed," and the *Westminster Confession*: "So will He have that day unknown

to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and *be always watchful*, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, *Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly, Amen.*" (Compare Brookes's *Maranatha.*) So Dr. Wood (*Last Things*), in answer to the question whether any events are to intervene previous to the Lord's Coming remarks: "It is enough to say that while it seems to me that there may be some things to be done before Antichrist shall be destroyed, and, therefore, before the Millennium shall actually commence, I have not been able to discover that there is *one event* of which we can say with *certainty* that it *must precede* the appearing of the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and the gathering of His saints to meet Him in the air. This is the result of long and patient inquiry on my part, and not merely the rash language of a moment of excitement. Most sincerely do I wish I could live more constantly under the influence of this conviction, and that all my brethren were partakers along with me of the 'Strong Consolation' it affords." (Comp. the decisive language of Dr. Seiss, *Proph. Times*, New Ser. 1875, vol. 1, p. 53–5, and in *Last Times* and *Apoc.*; Spurgeon's declaration that the Advent may occur at any time, *Proph. Times*, vol. 4, p. 74, etc.). It is sufficient to point out that the State Prophetical Convention at New York, took this decided position, when it adopted the following resolution: "This Second Coming of the Lord Jesus is everywhere in the Scriptures represented as imminent, and *may occur at any moment*; yet the precise day and hour thereof is unknown to man and known only to God." We hold to Cunninghame's position (*Visions*, p. 100): "If we, who have watched every sign in the spiritual horizon for a long series of years, were now asked, 'Is any sign of His Coming, yet accomplished?' we should be constrained to answer, 'To our view, *not one sign remains unaccomplished.*' If we were further asked, 'Shall He come this year?' our answer would be, 'We know not; but this much we know and believe, *that He is at hand, even at the door.*'" Numerous such testimonies might be given, and, for the truth's sake, we are glad that they are presented.

Obs. 8. The commanded position of constant watching given by Jesus and the apostles, throws light on the reason why we have the extraordinary omission of a directory or form of Church government. Such an avoidance is intentional, because it alone accords with the spirit of looking for the Saviour's speedy return, and the proof is found in the historical fact (Props. 76 and 77), that just so soon as men devised codes and forms of government—aside from the few simple directions given for guidance—then, in view of the idea of permanency entailed, the looking and watching for the Advent was relaxed, and finally almost ignored.

Our position in reference to the signs vindicates the attitude of the Primitive Church. Now men sneeringly point to the early Church, and scoffingly tell us that that Church, under the teaching of inspired apostles and their immediate successors, was utterly mistaken and too credulous, evincing an erroneous belief. But we hold, that *simple consistency* demanded the faith expressed by them, because the Advent (as we have shown) is not limited by any chronological period; the signs predicted to precede such an Advent were witnessed even in their day, and the culminated Antichrist is only revealed between the two stages of the Sec. Advent. Hence their attitude was scriptural and demanded by the times. Even the sign which is supposed to have been the least visible, viz., the extension of the Gospel, was sufficiently manifested to excite the spirit of watching. Thus e.g. let any one ponder the statements of Col. 1 : 6, 23; Rom. 10 : 18; Acts 2 : 9–11, and 1 Pet. 1 : 1, and they meet the conditions of witnessing. The same language was continued by Justin Martyr: "There is no people, whether Greek or Barbarian, among whom prayers and thanksgiving are not offered to the Father and Creator of the world in the name of Christ crucified;" so Irenæus speaks of the Church extending to the ends of the earth, even to Libya, Egypt, among the Celts, Iberians and Germans; so Tertullian: "Even all the boundaries of the Spaniards, and the different nations of the Gauls, and those parts of Britain which were inaccessible to the Romans are become subject to Christ," or "Everywhere are to be found the disciples of the Crucified—among the Parthians and Medes, the Elamites and Mesopotamians, in Armenia and Phrygia, Cappadocia and Pontus, Asia Minor, Egypt and Cyrene, mingled with the various tribes of the Getuli and Moors, in Gaul and Spain, and Britain and Germany;" so also Origen, referring to Ezekiel says: "When, before the Advent of Christ, did the land of Britain agree in the worship of one God? But now,

GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

on account of the churches which are spread to the uttermost bounds of the world, the whole earth invokes the God of Israel." Thus individuals, in every part of the world, are represented as testifying; the Gospel was extensively circulated, so that even *this sign* was not lacking, but stood forth with great prominency and lustre. How can any one, therefore, censure them for their expressed faith and hope?

Obs. 9. These signs, so saddening because of the evil unfolding, should not unduly depress the believer. They should rather confirm his faith, urge to increased watching and prayer, influence to a firm and vigilant occupying until He comes, and fill him with renewed hope and love at the speedy Coming of the Beloved One. Yea, as the Master declared (Luke 21 : 28) we should "*look up and lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh.*" For these purposes they are given, and hence a practical application of them to heart and life is designed, and not a mere theoretical acquiescence without a corresponding influence.

Dr. Seiss (*Last Times*, p. 299), beautifully and forcibly says: "God's method of progress is to make darkness the way to light, death the prelude to life, despair the introduction to salvation, and corruption and confusion the road to order and glory. It is not in what seems hopeful, but in what seems gloomy and untoward, that we are to look for *the signs* of the speedy forthcoming of God's wonder-working goodness. It is the stirring upon the face of the dark waters that gives prognostic of the breaking forth of light, life, and beauty. The bursting glories of spring come directly out of the bleak winter. It is from the corrupting seed that we obtain the harvest. The darkest hour is said to be that which immediately precedes the day. The period most hopeful is that when the apparent motives for despondency are most overwhelming. The stress of the controversy between hope and fear always falls upon the eve of triumph. Those dim hours of dismay to the scattered followers of Christ at His Crucifixion, were but the preludes to the bringing in of light and immortality for man. The bloody persecutions under the Roman Emperors which threatened the extinction of Christianity, were the immediate precursors of its victory over even the throne of the Cæsars. And so the Scriptures teach that it will be in the ushering in of the great consummation. The sun must darken, and the moon withhold her light, and then shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings." So Brookes (*Lects. during Lent*, p. 152) remarks: "Though I distinguished only some few signs as in themselves cheering, yet when considered as the tokens of our Lord's approach, *all* are cheering: therefore He bids us, as in the text, 'when we shall see these things only *begin* to come to pass, to lift up our heads because our *redemption* draweth nigh.' And if the *beginnings* of these things are calculated to inspire us with hope and joy, how much more their *fulness!* Yes those things which are dark and appalling to the world—like the pillar and the cloud—will be as light and brightness to the saints; who, when all is roaring and raging and upheaving round about them, shall be ardently waiting for, but most surely expecting, and in the midst of it obtaining, *deliverance* from corruption, into the glorious—glorious liberty of the children of God." We are sometimes censured as taking too gloomy a view of the world existing, and that we entertain "no love for the world." Our apology is, that we receive, embrace, and defend the view *that the Spirit gives* of the present and future, and that it is true, that we strive to set "*our affections on things above and not on things of the world,*" well knowing that "*if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him,*" 1 John 2 : 15.

PROPOSITION 175. *The doctrine of the Kingdom is greatly obscured and perverted by the prevailing one of the conversion of the world prior to the Advent of Jesus.*

The *Whitbyan theory* of the conversion of the world previous to the Second Advent is, probably, in the minds of many *the chief obstacle* to the reception of our doctrine. It may, therefore, form the subject of additional remarks.

*Obs.*1. Those who hold that the Church, being the covenanted Kingdom, is to extend itself until it embraces within its fold all nations, ought to be able to explain *how it comes that none* of the churches founded by the apostles and their immediate successors *believed* in such a conversion of the world. Surely if a scriptural doctrine, *it ought* at that time, and under such auspices, to have been, by way of encouragement, presented. It too would have been eminently calculated to remove (see Prop. 98, Obs. 3), limited views of the Divine Purpose. The nature of the Kingdom believed in, their belief in a speedy Advent, their doctrinal position, positively forbid the entertaining of the opinion that the world is to be converted prior to the Advent (see e.g. Prop. 73). "The vivid hope of the speedy return of Christ to the earth of the first Christians" (so Schlegel, *Philos. His.*, Lec. 10), alone prevented such a doctrine from being received (see Props. 74 and 75). When a change was gradually introduced (Props. 76 and 77), and the Origenistic theory was advocated by which a triumph of the Church was predicted running almost parallel with the dispensation, Neander tells us (*His. Ch.*, vol. 1, p. 129), "*such an anticipation was foreign to the thoughts of the older teachers of the Church.* They could conceive of the Pagan state in no other relation than one of constant hostility to Christianity, and *expected the triumph of the Church only as the result of a supernatural interposition at the Second Coming of Christ.*" It is not necessary to detain ourselves on a point so universally conceded, viz., that the Apostolical and Primitive Fathers only looked for Millennial blessedness *through the Second Advent of Jesus.* Their utterances of "the last times" (Ignatius) of evil, of an "unrighteous age" (Lactantius) to give place to "*a Sabbath*" only at the Advent, etc., and the expressed hope of deliverance, etc., for themselves and the race at that period, are *too definite* to be denied. Neander (comp. Prop. 74, Obs. 2) hence (*His. Dog.*, p. 247) says: "In the first age the earnest gaze of the believers was directed only to the last Coming of Christ," and he informs us that "this anticipation of the end was, perhaps, necessary for that age." But why should such an "error" (so pronounced) be necessary? Was not truth equally as well adapted to the early Christians as to Origen, or Augustine, or Whitby? Such a plea is *derogatory* to the founders of Christianity. In another place (Prop. 74, etc.) it has been shown that the belief in the Kingdom which was linked with

the Advent was the cause of those ardent longings for the Advent, thus preserving *due consistency* between the doctrine entertained and the hope expressed. Their faith, however explained, shows how believers, instructed by inspired men, understood the commission to preach the Gospel, and comprehended the covenants and prophecies. But we go a step farther back, to the Apostles themselves, who did not, and in the nature of the case could not, teach the conversion of the world *prior* to the Advent. We will allow a scholarly opponent, who would only have been too glad to avail himself of a teaching in support of his own theory if it had existed, to tell us what the Apostles believed and taught on the subject. Neander (*Ad. to His. Ch. Church*, vol. 2, p. 65, Bohn's ed.), after reiterating that the Apostles did not look for the conversion of the world, but rather for the Advent of Christ (saying: "*Every unprejudiced reader* of the New Test. *cannot fail to perceive that* such an expectation filled the souls of the Apostles"), adds: "It was not the idea of a renovated time that Christianity endeavored to realize, but everything appeared only as a point of transition *to a new, heavenly, and eternal order of things which would commence at the Second Advent.*"[1] Schmid (*Bib. Theol. New Test.*, p. 510) speaks of Paul's teaching in such a way that the idea of a conversion previous to the Advent *cannot be maintained*, for it includes *a constant conflict* going on between the Church and the world until *it culminates* in the Antichrist and the Advent. Thus numerous writers. If the reader will turn to Propositions 70, 71, 72, 73, 74 and 75, reasons are given in detail for our position on this subject. With the views of the Kingdom entertained, the manner of introduction, etc., it was *simply impossible* for them to preach a doctrine like the Whitbyan, now so fashionable and prevailing. In an argument like this, bearing upon the great burden of prophecy, it is no small matter that our doctrine *accords* so remarkably and fully with that of the first centuries.[2]

[1] Neander is so admirably candid (would that all imitated him!) that we cannot refrain from adding some more extracts. In *His. Plant. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, pp. 182–3, he frankly admits that the apostles *did not look* for the conversion of the world, but exhorted all to put their hope in a personal Advent of Christ and that while they anticipated the Gospel to be preached to all the nations of the earth, yet "they also believed that the persecutions of the ruling power would continually become more intense till the Saviour by His divine power should achieve the triumph of the Church over all opposing power." He thinks this "*an enthusiastic longing* that outstripped the tedious development of history." But if Paul was wrong in believing that persecution, more or less, should accompany the Church and finally culminate, and that the Church's triumph could only thus be secured —how are we sure that he is *not wrong* on other subjects. If a man of apostolic character, under *the special training* of the Spirit, called to be "an instrument for publishing divine truth in unsullied purity" (Neander) could be *mistaken* in this respect and give us "error" (some friends kindly call it in us "heresy") instead of truth, *why* should he not be in "error" in other respects. This is *a dangerous* method of dealing with the Word, as is evidenced by the reasoning of unbelief. We commend Neander's candor when he comes to explain Paul's language to the Thessalonians (*Plant. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 203, etc.) in which he acknowledges that Paul does not deny, to meet their expectation of Christ's immediate re-appearance, that they were mistaken in their ideas that Christ would thus come, set up His Kingdom, etc., but corrects their notion, respecting its being so imminent, etc. After informing us with frankness how Paul tells them that certain events must intervene in the rise and progress of evil, he adds: "then would Christ appear, in order by His victorious divine power to destroy the kingdom of evil, after it had attained its widest extension, and to consummate the Kingdom of God." With all Neander's greatness and attempt to excuse Paul (on the ground that he "was not aware that similar phenomena" i.e. great conflicts with evil—"must often recur until the arrival of the final crisis"), we would *rather take Paul's statement*, simple as it is, than

Neander's, fortified by a philosophical development theory. Paul's testimony is divine; Neander's is fallible. Besides this: such "often" recurring "phenomena" are utterly opposed to his "leaven" theory if logically pressed.

[2] Our historical references, etc., show what estimate we are to form of the sweeping assertions of some of our opponents. Thus e.g. Prof. Sanborn (*Millenarianism: An Essay*) declares *against the indisputable facts* of history: "The Church of Christ, with great unanimity, *in all ages*, has taught that the world is to be converted by 'the foolishness of preaching,' accompanied by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." This may mislead the ignorant, *certainly not* the scholar or student. Sometimes when reading such statements, we scarcely know what to think of those who make them; but in charity suppose that *prejudice* blinds them to the plainest historical facts. On the other hand it is refreshing to find writers who present the historical truth. Thus e.g. Dr. Fisher in art. "Millennium" (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) declares that the idea of the conversion of the world and its subjection to the Church was a great reason prompting to the rejection and proscribing of our doctrine. He then informs us that Origen was "the first of the ancient ecclesiastical writers to affirm the practicability of such a triumph of the Gospel through its own inherent efficacy." He also adduces Augustine as confirming and establishing the opinion "that the earthly Kingdom of Christ is the Church, which was even then in the Millennial era, and on the road to a glorious ascendency over all its enemies." The Whitbyan theory that the Millennium proper was still future had not then been concocted, for, by a perversion of prediction and chronology, the Church was represented as already realizing it, as we have shown in the history of the doctrine. The early Church, as all history testifies, as our learned opponents candidly admit, did *not hold* the views as expressed by modern writers, as e.g. in the art. "Infallibility of the Bible and Recent Theories of Inspiration" (*North Brit. Review*, Nov. 1852), which confidently predicts, that "the mission of the Bible is to conquer the age and not to yield to it," for it "is going forth to the ends of the earth conquering and to conquer," etc.; or to the art. "The Conversion of the World to Christ" (*Quarterly Review*, Ap. 1873) which gives us similar prophecies. Such specimens of an abounding class, are *directly antagonistic* to the early faith and hope of the Church; and the simple fact that such an opposition exists ought to lead the careful student to reflection, nothwithstanding its advocacy by eminent and talented writers, lecturers, etc.

Obs. 2. Let the reader carefully notice a feature (that is overlooked even by men of ability) which shows *how deeply rooted* some portions of the early Church doctrine remained. However much the Origenistic and Augustinian views (which allied the Millennial predictions with this dispensation, commencing with the Advent of Christ or the day of Pentecost, etc.) prevailed and the prophetic delineations of the Kingdom in its glory were—especially after Constantine's conversion—applied to the Church as her predicted triumph and dominion,[1] yet even then the adherents of such opinions never advocated such a conversion of the world that all evil would cease, etc. For we find in their writings the most abundant evidence that they anticipated more or less evil down to the Advent, the culmination of Anti-christian power before the Advent, etc., thus *retaining* in a great measure the early characteristics. Even men of eminence, who greatly assisted the development of the Papacy and quoted the Millennial prophecies as applicable to the existing Church, had *no conception of the Whitbyan doctrine*, for even Gregory the Great (A.D. 590, Neander's *Mem. of Ch. Life*, p. 387) said: "As the end of the world approaches, the times are full of disquiet and evil increases." The universal feeling of anxiety, etc., caused by the partial rejection of the early Church view and the adoption of a spiritualistic interpretation of prophecy, in the year A.D. 1000 and succeeding dates (supposed to be *the closing of the Millennium* of the Church) forms the best evidence that a general conversion of the world *prior* to the Advent *was not adopted.* The student needs no extracts from this period to verify the statement, seeing that the universal consternation (of which historians speak at the ending of the successive periods supposed

to embrace a spiritual Millennium) is abundant proof. Even when the Popish doctors settled down into the conviction that the thousand years was merely a round indefinite number indicative of an indefinite period embracing this dispensation; and when in accordance with this opinion Millennial predictions were unhesitatingly adopted as descriptive of the Papacy, and the Popes with faithful adherents dreamed of, and claimed, an universal monarchy, yet *even then* all this was done under the assumption—not that the Millennial state was future but—that the Millennial era was then existing, had existed from the first Advent, and would exist down to the Second Advent preceded by the Antichrist.[2] Such views even were still greatly modified and restricted by the utterances given at various times by advocates of the Papacy, who claimed *the nearness* of the Advent, *the continued wickedness* of the world, and *the corruption* constantly manifested in the Church itself. It would be interesting, although foreign to our design, to present the warnings, faithful rebukes, etc., that came not only from the protesting Albigenses and others, but from even those regarded as the faithful allies of Rome.

[1] Of which Dr. Arnold (*Life of*, by Stanley, vol. 1, p. 59,) remarks: "The pretended conversion of the kingdoms of the world to the Kingdom of Christ in the fourth and fifth centuries, which I look upon as one of the greatest *tours d'adresse* that Satan ever played, except his invention of Popery." Comp. Mosheim, Neander, Kurtz, etc., who show that this conversion to Christianity was largely nominal, for aside from the continued corruption of the masses, the king himself was not free from indulging in lawless license. Leckey, in his *His. Europ. Morals* points out with evident relish that kings and princes, converted from barbarism, who are regarded as famous fosterers of the Church, were guilty of gross violations, some of them, most eminent, having (e.g. vol. 2, p. 363) their several wives and numerous concubines. Comp. Killen's *Ancient Church*, p. 280, etc.

[2] It is a matter of surprise that the old Popish view of a past Millennium dating its rise from the First Advent, or from the day of Pentecost, or from the conversion of Constantine, etc., should be advocated by a few Protestants. By far the strongest advocate of this view is Prof. Bush (*Millennium*), but it is very unsatisfactory and most arbitrary, calling for spiritualizings, and for a Millennium still requiring martyrs (owing to persecution, etc.) *utterly opposed* to the Millennial predictions. A theory of the Kingdom which demands for the sake of consistency, such a sacrifice of prophecy to adapt the latter to the past, is most certainly defective. So plain is it, by comparing the history of the Church with Millennial prophecy, that the Millennium has not yet appeared that but few venture to adopt such a theory—*so repulsive to fact*—and the immense majority of our opponents concede its location in the future. While some of the Popes, acutated by ambition and desire, dreamed that under them and their successors the world would be made subject to the Papacy, they held this as a result of present existing Millennial predictions being realized, and taught with it continued existing unbelief to be followed by a season of trial, etc., for the end was always dreaded. Any claim of alleged universality, as e.g. in the Romish Church (comp. Bh. Newton's Diss., p. 439,) is in itself suspicious, being the mark of the Antichrist), who shall, as prophecy proclaims, declare a universality. The boast and glory of universality is condemnatory and the result of apostatizing, because owing to the predicted (comparative) fewness of believers in contrast with a prevalence of the rejection of the true faith those who eulogize it and make it an evidence of divine foundation, those who dream after it as desirable, only give a decided proof of *a total misapprehension* of the design of this dispensation.

Obs. 3. The Reformers and their immediate successors still more or less under the influence of the Augustinian method of applying the prophecies, *refused to believe in a Millennium still future prior to the Advent of Jesus.* However contradictory they may have been in some of their expositions of Scripture, *one thing is certain*, from the positive statements made and opinions entertained at the close of life, that they could give no encouragement to a triumph and deliverance of the Church *previous to* the Advent

of the Lord Jesus Christ. A few references may be in place. In commenting on John 10 : 11–16 (Walch's *Luther*, vol. 2, cols. 1082–83) : "*This is not true and is really a trick of the devil*, that people are led to believe *that the whole world shall become Christian.* It is the devil's doing, in order to darken sound doctrine and to prevent it from being understood. . . . Therefore *it is not to be admitted*, that the whole world, and all mankind shall believe on Christ ; for we must continually bear the sacred cross, that they are *the majority* who persecute the saints." His belief in the nearness of the Advent (Prop. 78), as evidenced in his *Exp.* of Dan. 12, (comp. also Walch's *Luther's Schriften* 22, col. 21, *Table Talk*, ch. 2, etc.), and as Bengel noticed : " he believed also, with many others, that the duration of the world " (as at present constituted, see Prop. 146), " from its commencement, would be only 6000 years ; and hence considered its end so near, that he could *see no space for a future Millennium*" (see Prop. 143).[1] Calvin is also outspoken, as e.g. *Com.* on Matt. 24 : 30, " *There is no reason, therefore, why any person should expect the conversion of the world*, for at length—when it shall be too late, and will yield them no advantage, they shall look on Him whom they have pierced." So in his comments on Matt. 13 : 24–43 ; Luke 18 : 8 ; John 15 : 18 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 1 ; 2 Tim. 3 : 1–7 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 3 (quoted by Dr. Seiss in *A Question in Eschatology*) and in his *Psychophannychia*, p. 55 (quoted *Time of the End*, p. 3), *Instit.*, B. 3, ch. 9, etc., we have it distinctly announced that the Church down to the Second Advent will be a mingled body of good and bad ; will be " burdened with the reprobate *to the end* of the world ;" will have " unbelievers to abound," so that " *there will be almost none to look for Him ;*" will find it " *never possible* for its godly teachers to avoid the hatred of the world ;" will have reason to expect " that as false teachers formerly gave annoyance to the people of Israel, so they will *never cease* to disturb the Church ;" and " that there will not be even under the Gospel, *such a state of perfection*, that all vices shall be banished and virtues of every kind shall flourish ; and that, therefore, the pastors of the Christian Church will have quite as much to do with wicked and ungodly men as the prophets and godly priests had in ancient times" (adding : " *this is the lot of the Church*").[2] Those who desire individual testimony can find the earnest and emphatic declarations of several hundred of the most eminent men in the Church from the days of the apostles down to the present, given in works specially devoted to the subject.[3] As an indication, all sufficient, of the feeling at the Reformation, it is sufficient to point out the fact that the great leading Confession of Faith, the Augsburg Confession, positively forbids the entertainment of a belief in the conversion of the world *prior* to the Second Advent (see Prop. 78, Obs. 2, (4), (b)). The Anabaptists, as evidenced by history, attempted to set up the predicted universal Kingdom of Christ, and the Seventeenth Article of the Confession, specially designed against them, " condemn those who spread abroad Jewish opinions, that, *before the resurrection of the dead*, the godly shall occupy the kingdom of the world, the wicked being everywhere suppressed " (Müller's *Symb. Books*, p. 43), and in the Twenty-third Article the Reformers evince no hope in *a future Millennium before the Advent* by stating that they were then living in " the last times and days foreshown in Holy Scripture, in which the world is to become ever more and more degenerate, and mankind more sinful and weak" (Müller's *Symb. Books*, p. 50). Nothing need be added to such plain statements.[4]

[1] See the same views given by Melanchthon, Knox, Hutter, Hunnius, Quenstedt, as quoted by Dr Seiss in *A question in Eschatology*, pp. 42–47. Also Piscator, Osiander, Flavius, Chrytræus, Bullinger, and Pareus, presented in Shimeall's *Eschatology*. Also, these and many others given by Elliot *Horæ Apoc.* and Taylor *The Voice of the Church*, and in *The Time of the End* by a Congregationalist. That Luther was decidedly opposed to the idea of such a conversion, see Michelet's *Life of Luther*, pp. 343–4. The Opinion of Luther as given by the Theolog. Faculty of the University of Dorpat to the Iowa Synod, etc. Luther in one or two places seems to contradict himself. Thus e.g. Lisco (*On the Parables*, p. 80) quotes Luther's Exp. of the Mustard Seed, as saying : "By which He means to inform us that the world should be converted to the faith in a manner fitted to excite wonder and give offence, namely, through weakness, in opposition to all power, wisdom, righteousness," etc. But while opposed "it shall itself prevail at last over all Kingdoms, and convert them to itself through the mighty power of God." Turning to his *Exp of the Leaven* (Lisco, p. 85, 86,) he limits this as follows : "When the Gospel, as a piece of new leaven, has once mixed itself with the human race, which is the dough, it will never cease till the end of the world, but will make its way through the whole mass *of those who are to be saved*, and come to all who are worthy of it, despite of all the gates of hell." Suppose, however, this contradiction to exist, the student will see the propriety of retaining those views given in detail, and matured by age and study, and confessionally expressed.

[2] Calvin (according to Dr. Brown in his *Reply* to Seiss's "Question in Eschatology,") also seems to be contradictory, for on Ps. 2 : 8, he says : "Who (Christ) alone subdues the world to Himself, and embraces all lands and peoples in His power. . . . . so that not one comes only, but the whole earth is subject to His sway." But by this Calvin does not necessarily include the conversion of the world, but only the fact—as believed in by us—that Christ will ultimately crush all opposition so that all, both the righteous and wicked existing down to the Advent shall acknowledge His power, etc. This reconciles His statements. Or, his meaning may be, that the Divine Sovereignty bends all, even wickedness, to subserve the Divine Purpose in Christ. The views of Knox we have previously given, and need no special mention. The declaration of the Westminster Confession, as quoted under Prop. 174, to be constantly watching for the Advent, alone sustains our position.

[3] E. G., Taylor's *Voice of the Church* and *The Time of the End* by a Congregationalist, contain the protest of hundreds of witnesses against the prevailing Whitbyan theory. So Brookes's *El. of Proph. Inter.*, Bickersteth's *Guide to the Prophecies*, Seiss's *Last Times*, Cox's *Millenarian's Answer*, Shimeall's *Eschatology, A Reply to Prof. Shedd*, and various other Millenarian authors, contain a large number of quotations from eminent men in all the various denominations against Whitby's "New Hypothesis."

[4] Rev. Dr. Seiss in quoting the Confession in his able treatise *A Question in Eschatology* refers to Melanchthon's explanations (*Corp. Ref. Melanchth. Op.*, vol. 26, p. 361,) and gives a long extract from John Conrad Goebel's *Exp.* of the Augsburg Confession, commencing : "The idea of a golden age in this world, before the resurrection of the dead, is a mere phantasm, not only contrary to the entire Holy Scripture, but especially contrary to the clear and lucid prophecies of the Lord Jesus Christ and His beloved apostles, when they speak of the times immediately preceding the day of judgment, Matt. 24 : 23 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 1 ; 2 Tim. 3 :1 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 3, and other places, where more may be seen upon the subject." He also refers to the *Apology* of the Augsburg Confession (Müller's *Symb. Books*, p. 245), *Articles of Smalcald* (Müller's *Symb. Books*, p. 298), and to various other leading confessions, embracing the same views, and thus giving no hope of a Millennial age before the Advent. The Confessions were so worded on this point that both Millenarians and Anti-Millenarians could subscribe to them ; a notable instance of which is found in the *Westminster Assembly Confession*, an Assembly largely composed of Millenarians (comp. Props. on the His. of our Doctrine). In reference to the Reformers, we only need to give the views of an opponent. Thus to show that the Reformers did not look for a future conversion of the world, but for the reverse, we have Barnes (*Com. Rev.*, ch. 10 : 6) saying : "The Reformers, in interpreting the prophecies, learned to connect the downfall of the Papacy with the Coming of Christ, and with His universal reign upon earth ; and as they saw the evidences of the approach of the former, they naturally anticipated the latter as about to occur. Comp. Dan. 12 :11 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 3 ; Dan. 2 : 34 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 8. The anticipation that the Lord Jesus was about to come ; that the affairs of the world, in the present form, were to be wound up ; that the reign of the saints would soon commence ; and that the permanent Kingdom of righteousness would be established, became almost *the current belief* of the Reformers, and was *frequently*

expressed in their writings." He instances Luther, and for proof refers to Merle D'Aubig. vol. 2, pp. 166, 275 ; Milner, pp. 692, 796, and then quotes Melanchthon, and Bh. Latimer. Comp. also the extracts given from Luther and Melanchthon by Lord in his *Apoc.*, pp. 236–240. Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 339) says : " Page after page might be filled with extracts from the writings of Luther, Calvin, Knox, and others, who were forced by the Holy Ghost to the foreground of the battle, showing how clearly they saw, and how eagerly they embraced the doctrine of Christ's personal Coming, and not ' the universal reception of the true religion,' as the proper object of believing contemplation. They have grace given them to bear testimony against the fanaticism of some who believed in a gross and sensuous Millennium, ' but,' as Dr. Lillie says, ' that they did, at the same time, generally and steadfastly hold to the ideas of a restored Israel, and a renewed earth, and, in particular, that not one of them ever allowed the modern notion of *an intervening Millennium* to becloud his solemn, earnest outlook for the Lord's Sec. Coming—so much is *perfectly well known to all who have a moderate acquaintance with their writings*." We only add, that such a position is the more honorable to them, because men, owing to success in their labors and the increase of adherents, are apt to judge the future from their personal influence, etc., but they swerved not from God's expressed judgment. (We refer to the Augsburg Confession under Props. 78, 7, etc.)

Obs. 4. While the opinion of such a conversion of the world was suggested, and at once opposed (as e.g. by Luther, Calvin, etc., in preceding Obs.) *no writer* of any prominence, or *theologian*, or *commentator*, appeared to advocate a Millennium *still in the future before the Advent of Christ*, until Daniel Whitby (an English commentator, born A.D. 1638, died 1726), appeared, unless we except the dreams of aggrandizement suggested by some of the Jesuits (see Prop. 78, Obs. 19). Bh. Henshaw, Drs. Lillie, Duffield, Seiss, and others, have doubted whether a writer could be found before the time of Whitby who suggested such a Millennial period *still future and prior* to the Advent ; and after years of research on subjects pertaining to Millenarianism we can find none *unless* we except the ravings of some Anabaptists or the schemes of some ardent followers of Loyola.[1] Whitby himself, being no mean scholar but well posted in Patristic learning and Church history, calls his theory of a Millennium (spiritual) still future to be introduced by Gospel means, a " *New Hypothesis* " (a mere new supposition), which he could and would not have done if such a " hypothesis" had *previously* been propounded. Many Anti-Millenarians (as e.g. Bh. Russell, *Dis. on Mill.*, Archd. Woodhouse *On the Apoc.*, Prof. Bush *On Mill.*, and others) have, while criticising the theory, *never called into question* Whitby's claim to newness of a hypothetical Millennium. Now it is this theory, adopted by able and pious men (as e.g. Edwards, Hopkins, Scott, Dwight, Jay, Barnes, and many others), which in a short time, has deeply and *almost universally* intrenched itself in the Church. Its advocates differ somewhat among themselves as to the means and instrumentalities by which it is to be ushered in (thus e.g. some simply advocating present means ; others, increased and marvellous outpourings of the Spirit ; others, some remarkable divine spiritual interposition of Christ ; and recent writers, even miraculous and supernatural interference), but still substantially agree in the outlines of the " hypothesis." The influence of such a theory upon the reception of our doctrine can be readily seen ; for it is hostile to it, being in direct conflict with it. Locating the Kingdom *in this dispensation and prior* to the Advent, having *no need* of a Pre-Millennial Personal Coming of Jesus, *spiritualizing* the throne, the Kingdom and the prophecies pertaining thereto, it conceives, from its " hypothetical " Kingdom thus spread over the earth, that no such Kingdom *as is covenanted and grammatically expressed in the Word* is to be

established *after* the Advent of Christ. Such a spiritual fulfilment of prophecy is all, they think, that we are to anticipate, and the early Church belief on the subject is, therefore, discarded as "an idle dream," or "a Jewish fable." What the immediate followers and churches of the Apostles could not possibly entertain on account of their "Jewish prejudices," and "the materialistic husk," is at last presented and elucidated in Whitby's "New Hypothesis." It becomes necessary consequently for the sake of completeness in our argument to notice *the unscriptural character* of this theory, so productive of *widespread unbelief* in the doctrines of God's eternal Word.[2]

[1] Some intelligent writers not observing the proper distinction between the Origenistic and Augustinian view and that of Whitby's, have called this statement into question, but no one has yet succeeded in producing an author, acknowledged by the Church, who lived before Whitby's time who advocated what is now known as the Whitbyan theory. A spiritual Millennial theory, locating the fulfilment of the prophecies either in the past or as running in connection with the dispensation is something very different from one like Whitby's, which locates the realization in the future, etc. For Whitby's own views, see his *Treatise on the true Millennium*, and for an extension of them, see Bogue's *Dis. on the Mill.*, and Johnston *On the Rev.* The nearest approach to Whitby's views is that found in Joachim's prophecies (see Von Döllinger's *Proph. of the Middle Ages*, vii., p. 380), or the statements of St. Catherine of Siena (p. 330), or Roger Bacon (p. 358), or Dolcino (p. 363), or Gorgius (p. 312). Luther, in his Com. on John, that we quoted, must have referred to the Jesuitical idea of a conversion of the world, or to the Anabaptist view, or to some Popish writer similar to the preceding. For however in some respects diverse to the purely spiritual view of Whitby, the notion of a conversion of the world to Christianity prior to the resurrection of the dead and hence of the Sec. Advent, has had its abettors, who daringly, to the ordinary operations of the Gospel, added that of the sword and persecution. The history of the Romish Church in the persons of some of its most aggressive Popes, and of Loyola and his successors, are sufficiently illustrative. The multitude who arose in the days of the Reformers with arms in their hands, and under leaders who wielded "the sword of Gideon;" even the dialectician Carlstadt and many a perverted believer thought that the harvest was ripe, that they were the appointed reapers, and that the Gospel combined with the sword should subjugate the world to Jesus. Self-constituted ministers of vengeance and of mercy, under the guidance of a false doctrine. Alas! what scenes of crime, bloodshed, and horror have been enacted under a fanatical plea that the extension of God's truth and rule demanded them. Thus e.g. in the Münster Faction (A.D. 1534) "Bockelson" or John of Leyden (Kurtz, *Ch. His.* vol. 2, p. 81) "proclaimed king of the whole earth by one of his co-prophets, set up a splendid court and introduced the most heinous abominations. He claimed authority to inaugurate the Millennium, sent out twenty-eight apostles to spread his kingdom, and appointed twelve dukes to govern the earth as his vicegerents." The same spirit was shown in the Wittenberg Fanaticism, in the Münzer teaching, culminating in the Peasant's War. The same spirit was revived in the Fifth Monarchy men, and others. The enemies of the Word sneeringly point to many such instances of compulsory conversion or vengeance, as shown in the sternness of some of Knox's converts, Cromwell's troopers, Geneva's town-councillors, etc., just as if the Word itself indorsed, and was responsible for conduct and action emphatically condemned. Our doctrine, in view of the Millennial age being contingent on the Advent of Jesus and the res. of the saints, positively forbids the entertainment of such dangerous vagaries. Those who hold to them cannot be regarded as affiliated, in the slightest degree, with Pre-Millenarians, seeing that in the fundamentals there is no point of contact. They are rather in sympathy with all such who, prior to the Sec. Advent and the res. of the saints, look for a conversion of the world to subjection to Christ, the only difference being in the one party relying upon the Gospel and the other adding the sword. Craven (Lange's *Com. Rev.* p. 346) refers to Elliott saying: "Vitringa, however, who alludes to Whitby's work just published, makes brief citations from two earlier writers, Conrad of Mantua and Carollus Gallus, as expressive of the same general view." If this is so, then to Whitby belongs the honor of systematizing and inaugurating the view in such a manner as to secure its extensive adoption.

[2] An impartial consideration is solicited, in view of the important bearing this subject necessarily has upon many related ones in the Scriptures. It is to the honor of many

eminent men, that, after having held to the Whitbyan theory, they have not been ashamed to acknowledge their past error, and that the decided weight of testimony forced them to occupy the Primitive Church doctrine. Thus e.g. Bh. Hopkins (Winthrop's *Letters*, p. 6) declares that his opinions have undergone "a thorough revolution," and adds, "And I cannot but think that any man whose mind is ready to submit, with the humility of a child-like faith, to the only infallible teacher—the Word of God—must yield, even at the sacrifice of his previous prejudices, to *the vast amount of testimony* which the Scriptures furnish to that important doctrine, the personal Advent, and reign upon the regenerated earth, of the glorious Redeemer," etc. The honored friend to whom this work is dedicated, informed me years ago how he also changed his views, being impelled to it by Scripture testimony, and the reasoning of McNeile, Noel, etc. On the evening of March 27th, 1873, in a conversation on this very subject, the Dr. alluded to the biblicist Beck and read Dr. Kurtz's estimate of Beck in which the latter is quoted as saying that his hope of the ultimate salvation of the world was in the direct interposition of God. Commenting on this language, Dr. Sprecher remarked, that by this direct interposition, Beck evidently referred to the Sec. Advent. Then alluding to Bengel's and Auberlen's views, he continued, that since he had adopted such ideas, time and study had only strengthened them; that he had no hope of the conversion of the world under present instrumentalities; that it was painfully evident that human depravity would always exist in this dispensation; that whatever advance the Church made, there was a corresponding advance on the side of Satan; that the future was *a serious one* for the Church as she was yet to meet a terrible enemy; and that to save the Church, there must be, as Beck affirmed a remarkable divine interposition, etc. Such, briefly, is the outline of a deeply interesting conversation—the ideas of which were repeated, with additions, at subsequent interviews. In conversations with students, in articles from the *Lutheran Observer*, in sermons, and in an appeal to the churches in behalf of the college (of which he was then President), he alluded to the coming struggle between the Church and infidelity, the fatal results of indifference — the consequent depression of the Church and the incoming of sore tribulation to be ended only by the Advent of the Christ. He also informed me that his forthcoming work of systematic divinity would occupy a Pre-Millenarian position.

The prevalence of the Whitbyan theory is something marvellous, and the tenacity with which men cleave to it, notwithstanding *its lack of proof*, is wonderful. Out of a multitude of protests we select the two following: Rev. Randolph (*Danville Tribune*, March 12th, 1880), referring to the Whitbyan theory and to Whitby's bolstering up his view by transforming 2 Thess. 2 : 8 into a spiritual Coming by the preaching of the Gospel, then adds: "We feel indignant as we think of it, and how the Church and common people have been enslaved to it so long. It has been sent whirling like thistle-down in the air by scholars in every denomination, and its doctrine that the Millennium comes by means of Revivals, and the gradual progress of Christianity one thousand years before Christ comes, has been riddled to atoms, and is now riddled again by the best scholarship of the century. Thanks to Rev. Henry Dana Ward, a true Puritan, for the bugle-blast he gave not many years ago, arousing the American ministry to their duty, in reference to Whitbyism, saying, 'scarcely a newspaper can be found of high standing with its own sect, that will admit an article boldly questioning this proud Philistine, who has seized the ark of our faith and defies the hope of Israel. This state of things calls for mourning as well as indignation, that an innovation so bold in its departure from the primitive faith and the Confessions of all churches should have *intrenched itself in the heart* of all denominations, which innovation the Reformers, themselves, expressly condemn and brand as opposed to the Scriptures' (*His. Mill.*, p. 58). Thanks to Dr. Hastings (*Voice of the Church*) for his manly utterance challenging the insolence of the great and acute innovator in these words: 'Was it reserved for Daniel Whitby to correct the faith of those who had listened to Apostolic teachings, and followed Apostolic footsteps? Has that, which was an unknown doctrine, or a condemned heresy in the true Church for seventeen hundred years, come at last to be accepted as the truths of the Gospel? And shall we whose fathers have steeled themselves against earth's flatteries, ever sounding the word, 'The Coming of the Lord draweth nigh!' now fold our arms in lazy lock and say in our hearts, if not on our lips, 'My Lord delayeth His Coming!' To all which we say, 'God forbid!' And thanks to the noble Christian men of such competence and piety, in both Europe and America, and of all denominations, who, by pulpit, conference, and publications, are once more recalling the Church to the faith of the Reformers, Martyrs, and Apostles, the faith of all the prophets, and of Christ Himself." Dr. Morehead in the *Christian Instructor* (Chicago, March and April, 1879), in a series of

articles controverts the Whitbyan view, and in the close of the second article, after referring to the primitive expectation (quoting Scripture, Olshausen, Calvin, etc.) of the constant imminency of the Sec. Advent, deduces : " (1) The Apostolic Christians *waited* for Christ. They knew not how long he might tarry ; they knew not how soon He might appear. They might fall asleep, but death itself could not destroy their ' blessed hope.' (2) They *waited* for Christ. Therefore, their hope was not the reformation of mankind, nor the civilization of the race, nor the elevation of society, nor the education of the masses, nor the conversion of the world. (3) They *waited* for Christ. Therefore, they did not look for the overthrow of the world-spirit of evil through the instrumentality of the Gospel which they preached. Their heroic endeavor was to save souls from the curse and condemnation of the world. (4) They *waited* for Christ. Therefore, they did not wait for an effusion of the Holy Spirit for the world's conversion. The Spirit had been poured out upon them, according to the promise of the Saviour, and to have waited for His Coming would have been a practical denial of His presence in the Church. (5) They *waited* for Christ. Therefore, they did not look for the world's subjugation first. Where in all the New Test. is the Church put in the posture of expectancy as to the conversion of the world? Let one passage be cited that she waited for that—was so taught to wait. (6) They *waited* for Christ. Therefore, they could not have waited for a Millennium, brought about by the agencies even then at work, to be had and enjoyed before Christ's Coming, for if so, how, in all human reason, could they have waited for the Saviour? *They waited.* We, on the contrary, having succeeded to our satisfaction in putting off His Coming to a far, far distant future, naturally enough concern ourselves very little about it, and have taken to make the best of the present evil world."

In view of the Scripture testimony and that of the Church, it is a matter of surprise that eminent Apologetical works (as e.g. Roger's *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, p. 65, etc.) should assert that the New Test. propounds a system of religion " which aspires to universal dominion, and that to be achieved without violence, and by moral force alone." Turning to the New Test. we see *how* Christ Himself comes, and uses force over the Anti-christian nations, and yet in the face of the plainest predictions, Rogers confidently affirms : " It is equally incontrovertible that He renounced for Himself, and that His apostles renounced for Him, all employment of force in the establishment of His novel Kingdom." This is true of the Church and the gathering out of a people for God, but, as our whole line of argument shows, it is *not correct* when applied to the conversion of the world, or to the establishment of the covenanted Messianic Kingdom. The reason why this Whitbyan doctrine is a favorite with many, and is so prominently paraded in recent Apologetics, is, that it serves to exalt a fundamental misconception, viz., their spiritual-Church Kingdom notion. Alas ! that so many able writers fall into this error, which has been a fitful dream of some of the mystics, as seen e.g. in the *Life of Julia Von Krüdener*, who, according to the prophecy of Maria Kummrin, was destined to a " high vocation in the reign of the Lord," having connected with her, " Fontaine as the apostle chosen to work with her for the conversion of the world" (*Westm. Review*, Jan. 1852, p. 96.)

Obs. 5. Let us direct attention to some of the reasons already assigned which are opposed to the Whitbyan theory. For the sake of brevity and to avoid undue repetition, reference will be made to Propositions giving details, and the reader is solicited, if desirous to investigate the subject, to turn to them for additional information. 1. The principle of interpretation adopted, viz., the grammatical, Prop. 4, is the only one that is proper for a doctrinal position upon this subject. But if the literal interpretation is acceded to, *then*, as our opponents themselves admit, our doctrine is clearly and unmistakably taught. For the difference between us and the followers of Whitby, is not whether the Word contains our doctrine *in its literal sense*, but whether such a sense *is to be retained.* Let the reader decide this question, and in how far it is consistent with the honor of God to present such a sense that has led a host of ancient worthies and Christians to believe in our doctrinal position. If the literal sense is accepted, of course, *then* the interpretation of prophecy utterly forbids the adoption of the Whitbyan " hypothesis." 2. The prevailing theory is based upon and is the logical outgrowth of, the notion that the Church is *the covenanted*

Kingdom of David's Son. This has been fully met in Propositions 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, and 109. 3. The scriptural idea of the Messianic Kingdom, as covenanted and prophesied, is strictly that of a Theocracy—overthrown, Prop. 32, but again restored, Props. 33, 34, 35, etc., fully identified with the restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom. Props. 48, 49, 51, 52, 118, etc. The conversion even of all nations *could not restore* the Kingdom. 4. The following particulars are all opposed to the Whitbyan doctrine (a) It overrides and degrades *the hopes* of the pious Jews, Props. 20, 21 ; (b) it ignores and lowers *the preaching* of John the Baptist, Props. 22, 38, 39, 40, 41, and of the disciples, Props. 43, 44 ; (c) it overlooks the fact that the Kingdom of God to be established is *the ancient Theocracy* acknowledged by God to be His special Kingdom, Props. 25, 26, etc., into which the Davidic line is incorporated, Prop. 31, and which was not in existence when Jesus came, Props. 41, 56 ; (d) the unmistakable *postponement* of the Kingdom, *the previous gathering out* of a people to whom the Kingdom is given, the consequent *preaching* of the Apostles, Props. 54 inclusive to 73, is all passed by as unworthy of notice, although specifically presented ; (e) it is opposed to *the distinctively announced facts* (which show that piety, conversion, etc., are not denoted), that the Kingdom belongs to Christ as the Son of Man (see Prop. 81), that it is a visible restoration of forfeited dominion (Prop. 82), that it is given by the Father to the Son as the result of obedience (Props. 83, 84, 90), and that it is promised to the saints as an inheritance (Props. 89, 90). 5. The *Millennial glory* which is to follow in the restoration of the Barren Woman after the married wife, Prop. 118, is against its reception. 6. The *Visible external* organization of the Kingdom, Props. 116 and 117, and its introduction *alone by* the power of Christ, Prop. 120, forbids such a view of the Messianic Kingdom as is now prevalent. 7. The *visible* reign of Christ, Prop. 131 ; the *visible* reign of the saints, Prop. 154 ; the *Judgeship* of Christ, Prop. 132 ; the *Judgment Day*, Prop. 133 ; "*The World to come*," Prop. 137 ; "*The Day* of the Lord Jesus," Props. 138 and 139 ; the "*Rest*," Prop. 143 ; "*The End of the age*," Prop. 140 ; "*The New Heavens and New Earth*," Props. 148, 149, 150, 151, 144, 146 ; the *transfiguration*, Prop. 153 ; the *manner* of the Jewish restoration and its *design*, Props. 111, 112, 113, 114 ; the *mixed condition* of Church evinced in the parables, Prop. 118 ; all present phases of argument converging from different points against the Whitbyan notion. 8. Besides all these, the doctrine of the *Pre-Millennial* Advent, Prop. 121 ; of the *Pre-Millennial* resurrection, Props. 125, 126, 127, 128 ; the destruction of the Antichrist *by the Personal* Advent of Jesus, Prop. 123 ; the *marriage* of Christ, Prop. 169 ; the *perpetuity* of the Kingdom when once established, Prop. 159, etc., are all of a nature irreconcilable with a conversion of the world *prior* to the Advent. To accept of the Whitbyan theory demands that all these several Propositions, with a large number of related evidences, be logically set aside—an undertaking that can alone be performed by seeking refuge in the Origenistic system of interpretation. The advocates of such a theory forget how clearly and distinctly *the design* of the present dispensation, Props. 86 and 87, is pointed out in Scripture, representing the Church as *a preparatory stage*, Prop. 88, to the ushering in of the glorious Messianic Kingdom. It is remarkable that for the complete success of our argument *not one link*, essential to its perfection, is missing in the Scriptures.

The Year of Jubilee was a type of the highest deliverance (Prop. 143), and is correctly applied by many writers to the Millennial period on earth. Even our opponents, many of them, concede this, and declared in positive terms, that "the promise of a Jubilee to the Church of God cannot fail." Let the reader observe that the Jewish nation, owing to depravity, never came under the restorative power of this Year of Jubilee, for their wickedness brought as a punishment rest (2 Chron. 36 : 21) to the land. So the world and the Church can never, as the Bible plainly teaches (it being *the personal work* of Jesus and His Advent) bring about this time of Jubilee. Men may by a species of exaggeration insure its Coming, but a glance at the type and the predictions based upon it shows that it is *beyond mortal power*. Burton (*Anat. of Melancholy*, vol. 3, p. 429) was wiser ; for after giving a graphic description of the evils pertaining to various religions, heresies, etc., he adds : "To purge the world of idolatry and superstition, will require some monster-taming Hercules, a divine Æsculapius, or Christ Himself to come in His own Person, to reign a thousand years on earth before the end, as the Millenaries will have Him." Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 580), speaking of the reasonableness of the Second visible Coming of Jesus, remarks : "History and experience even, give every reason to doubt whether without such a personal appearing and intervention of the King, the Kingdom of God could indeed ever arrive at the complete development and triumph, to which it is designed to come." Eminent men, unwilling to receive the plain grammatical sense of the Word, and having faith in God's promises, see no hope for the realization of the Whitbyan theory (although in accord with their spiritualizing system), and hence reject it. Dr. Arnold (*Life of*, by Stanley, vol. 1, p 271) expresses his faith in the ending of successive ages by great physical and moral signs, in the Coming of "the day of the Lord," and then, in view of these convulsions and the signs of the times, says : "But I have not the slightest expectation of what is *commonly* meant by the Millennial, and I wonder more and more that any one can so understand Scripture as to look for it. As for the signs of the times in England, I look nowhere with confidence," etc. On the other hand so confident are the adherents of the Whitbyan scheme of their ultimate success, that they make the matter largely contingent on the reception of money ! Many quotations might be given ; a recent one by Bh. Wiley (*West. Ch. Advocate*, July 30th, 1879) in a letter to a friend is sufficiently illustrative : "Money seems now the great need for taking the world for Jesus." While money is a requisite for Church work, and piety is required to contribute as evidence of its faith, gratitude and love, yet money will only indirectly aid in carrying out the design of the dispensation ; it may bring the truth to others, but it cannot convert a soul, much less "take the world for Jesus." Compare with such a view, the scathing remark of Cotton Mather (Prop. 78, Obs. 9, note), or the firm protest of Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com.* 1 *Tim.*, p. 50), etc.

Obs. 6. It seems scarcely requisite to add anything to what has preceded, and yet a few additional remarks may aid in bringing out the matter more clearly. 1. The exhortations given respecting the nearness of the Second Advent and the constant duty enjoined in looking for it, is *irreconcilable* with a Millennium *prior* to that Advent. So also the same incorporated into Confessions, as e.g. Westminster exhorting us owing to the uncertainty of the same to "*be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come.*" The advocates of the Whitbyan theory, locating an intervening one thousand years definitely *before* the Advent, palpably *contradict* themselves when commenting on such scriptural injunctions. Thus, e.g. Barnes in various places in his *Commentary* urges it as a duty for believers to be looking and expecting the Second Advent, telling us even (1 Pet. 4 : 7) that "No man can tell certainly at what time it will come ; no man can demonstrate *that it may not come at any moment*," etc., and yet in the face of these and similar *explicit statements* he endeavors by the adoption of the Whitbyan "hypothesis" to "*demonstrate*" that it is *at least* a thousand years from us. A theory which involves such inconsistencies is certainly wrong. 2. The inability to meet the demands of Scripture and constitute an agreement between theory and Holy Writ is met with in the writings of the ablest of the Whitbyan class.

We give two illustrations. Dr. Brown in *Christ's Sec. Coming*, unable to rid himself of the passages which speak of *a mixed condition* even in the Church, of good and bad down to the Advent, advocates a Millennial period in which the preponderating mass, the large majority shall only be righteous, and then taxes us with a kind of *exaggerating* the Millennial descriptions. But this is directly antagonistic to *the predicted universality* of righteousness given in Heb. 8 : 11 ; Jer. 31 : 34 ; Isa. 54 : 13 ; Isa. 11 : 9, etc. *Which* are we to credit, the Spirit or the imperfect Millennial era thus presented? Again : Dr. Neander (*Life of Christ*) ably and elaborately presents his development theory (derived from the leaven) until he has (as in Sec. 52) the whole world, universally subdued and there is "*a real world-dominion*," "*a perfect world-dominion of Christ and of His organs ; a world purified and transformed, to become the seat of His universal empire.*" All this is done morally and spiritually through the agency of the Church. But when we come (Sec. 214) to his interpretation of Luke 17 : 22–37 (into which Jerusalem, the Romans, etc., could not be conveniently crowded), *then* he admits—although he must have felt *how contradictory* to his favorite theory—that there will be "*a corrupt world*," and that "*the glorified Son of Man*" must appear and "*precede the consummation of the Kingdom.*" The leavening process, according to his own confession, is acknowledged to be a failure, and that world-wide dominion, which Daniel says is ever-enduring, he either must bring to a downfall through this corruption or must postpone until after the Advent of Christ.[1] 3. The Spirit's description of this dispensation (as e.g. in 2 Thess. 2 : 1–14 ; Dan. 11 and 12 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 1–25 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 1–14 ; Matt. chs. 24 and 25, etc.) abundantly evidence the fact *that down to the Second Advent* wickedness shall constantly exist and finally culminate into widespread infidelity, etc. Satan, instead of being bound, is busily engaged in sowing tares *down to* the period of the harvest, or the end of the age. Wicked men are represented as ever attached to the Church, the "few" *out of* the "many" only being the really faithful obedient believers. Now a development theory or conversion "hypothesis," which engrafts itself upon the parable of the leaven and of the mustard seed, but *ignores* the teaching of the parable of the tares and wheat and of the drag-net and the statements, positively given, of *a continuance of evil and evildoers down to the Advent*, is certainly one-sided and sadly defective. The retrogressions, relapses, continued mixed condition, etc., of the Church itself, shows what confidence can be placed in this leavening process. This is so sensibly felt that recent writers against us (as e.g. Waldegrave, *New Test. Mill.*) frankly admit that the antichristian powers will exist *down to* the Second Advent ; that the Church will continue to struggle on against wickedness *down to* the same period, and even proceeds to the revolting acknowledgment—forced by these Scriptures and by his placing the Advent after the Millennium—*that wickedness will so abound* during the thousand years *that martyrdom itself* shall be experienced by believers. Others, however, like Brown, Barnes, etc., are content with giving *a mixed* Millennial period sufficiently pervaded with wickedness to make *a revival of the martyr spirit* a necessity. How such statements can be reconciled with those of the prophets relating to the same period, we cannot comprehend, *unless* the inspired man is to give place to the uninspired.[2] 4. The blessings allied to the Millennial era, associated with the Messianic reign are of such a nature that the simple moral and spiritual means of the Gospel, even if the whole world were con-

verted, *cannot introduce them* (this has been pointed out in Props. 120, 6, etc.). Knowledge, piety, material prosperity, etc., cannot remove the suffering and evils attendant to human nature, for what Froude (*Shorter Studies*, p. 272) says specially of the latter is still true of all: "Let us build our streets of gold and they will hide *as many aching hearts* as hovels of straw. The well-being of mankind is not advanced a step." Knowledge, wealth, and piety cannot remove *the curse* with its consequent ills. If the predictions of the Prophets are received, it is impossible to see *how* they can be fulfilled by existing means. This is beginning to be realized by our opponents, so that the most recent of them (as Fairbairn, *On Proph.*, pp. 465, 451, etc.) frankly admit that to introduce and continue the Millennial blessedness and glory predicted, *additional* means of an *extraordinary* character, *supernatural and miraculous*, are necessary and will be employed.[3] 5. While we do not concede that the "Variations of Protestantism," or the disagreements of churches, or the "denudation" or retrogressive periods, can be urged against the claims of Christianity (for such a state is *foretold* and is *a consequent* of human freedom), yet it must be admitted that it has force against the notion of a conversion of the world. While there is *progress* arising from the Divine Purpose to save them that believe and to gather out a certain number of pre-determined ones (pre-determined in relation to His Kingdom), and from the intellectual activity, etc., incident to man, yet, account for it as we may, there have been periods of *depression* of the truth and these have been caused not only by direct persecution but even by that which humanity so highly prizes—reason, philosophy, etc. This, at least, should make us *cautious* in deducing such a conversion as many do, from the establishment of Christianity and the history of the past. And this cautious handling of the subject should be increased by considering that the preaching of the Gospel and even its success is *no criterion* whatever that God's judgments, *if predicted to come*, will not be poured out upon the world. For although Jerusalem was the centre of great missionary operations and multitudes were converted (Acts 2 : 41 ; 6 : 7, etc ; 21 : 20), and the Gospel was successfully preached over the known Roman world, yet all this *did not prevent* the vengeance of God from being poured out *at the appointed time*. Hence, the lack of success, or even success itself, is no just criterion of *the ultimate design* of the Almighty in reference to this dispensation ; for the object intended by both the one and the other must be gathered from *direct specifications* pertaining to them.[4] 6. This age or period is denominated an "*evil age*," i.e. "marked by sin and misery, this world, as compared with the future and heavenly one" (so Blomfield, etc.), and hence the very name bestowed upon it is indicative that it will never become the good and blessed age that many dream. The language of Gal. 1 : 4 that Christ "gave Himself for our sins that He might deliver us from *this present evil world* (*or age*"), and of John 15 : 19 ; 17 : 14-16 ; 1 John 5 : 19, etc., is *plainly significant* of the fact, evidenced by the sad experience of nearly nineteen centuries, that this age is evil, and continues to remain such, from which we can only expect deliverance through Christ.[5] 7. The fighting, struggling condition of the pious and of the Church, as presented in numerous passages as well as the promises of encouragement under persecution, etc. (2 Tim. 3 : 12 ; Acts 14 : 22 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 19 ; 1 Thess. 3 : 3, etc.), so clearly evince *the continued* and often triumphant *existence* of wickedness down to the Advent, that the same is *irreconcilable* with the

previous fulfilment of the Millennial predictions.[6] 8. The condition of the world *at* the time of the Advent is one of such extensive, prevailing wickedness that, in the very nature of the case, it shows that it is only *the outgrowth* of previously long-continued wickedness. For so widespread, cumulative a state of evil does not exist without a preparative course. For days to return like "*the days of Noah*" *and* "*the days of Lot*" (Luke 17 : 26–30), when but little "faith" will be found "on the earth" (Luke 18 : 8), when "perilous times" (2 Tim. 3 : 1–5) will come, when men shall be "mockers," etc. (Jude 18), when a mighty confederation of wickedness (Rev. 19, etc.) shall exist, etc., etc.—all this demands *a previous course* of evil training, which is consonant only with other descriptions pertaining to this age.[7] 9. The representations given concerning the ministry; the endurance of hardship and trial; the being a savor of life unto life to some and of death unto death to others; the rejection of them by those who cannot "endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall heap to themselves teachers," etc., etc., are all of a nature correspondent only with *a mixed state* in the Church and of *extensive wickedness* in the world. Even the charge of preaching and faithfulness in the ministry is based by Paul, in perfect agreement with our position on the simple gathering of the elect and not upon the conversion of the world. In the charge given to Timothy to make "full proof of his ministry" in "doing the work of an Evangelist," there is not the remotest allusion to *an anticipated success* in being instrumental in converting the world, but a direct reference—as if to crush such a notion if it should arise—to "*His* (Christ's) *appearing and His Kingdom*" (2 Tim. 4 : 1–5). 10. Thus many incidental reasons might be adduced confirmatory of our doctrinal position, such as (1) the existence of "*the times of the Gentiles*," by which Gentile domination during this period is denoted; (2) *the fearful persecution* to which the Church is to be exposed at the closing of this period; (3) the harvest (because the "wickedness is great," Joel 3 : 13) *precedes* the Millennial era, Rev. 14 : 14–20; (4) the instruction imparted by analogy in *the ending* of former dispensations so expressive of human depravity; (5) the conversion of the Jews induced by "*looking upon Him* whom they have pierced;" (6) the delineation of the dispensation *by John*, 1 John 2 : 18, 28; (7) the bestowal of the sovereignty of this world upon Christ is linked *with the resurrection and rewarding of the saints*, as e.g. Rev. 11 : 15–18; (8) the Millennial era is *preceded* by the overthrow and destruction of the kings of the earth, as e.g. Rev. 19 : 18, 19, compare Ps. 110 : 5, 6; (9) the gathering out of the people in place of the Jewish nation which rejected the truth, is followed *by the terrible vengeance* of God, first upon the Jewish nation and then at the close of their tribulation upon the Gentiles, as e.g. Deut. 32 : 21–43; (10) the nations shall come and worship God *when* His judgments are made manifest, as e.g. Rev. 15 : 4; Isa. 26 : 9; Zeph. 3 : 8–20; Zech. 14 : 16, etc.; (11) the conversion of the world is nowhere given *as a sign* (followed by an apostasy) of the approaching Advent of Christ; (12) the large class of passages which speak of the removal of the wicked *at a set time* out of the earth by "a consumption," "destruction," etc., as e.g. Mal. 4; Ps. 37; Ps. 104 : 35, etc.; (13) the manner in which the Apostles quote Millennial predictions identifying them *with the period* of the Advent and resurrection of the saints, as e.g. 1 Cor. 15 : 54; (14) the elect body of saints, converted and thus gathered out of the nations, are represented (James 1 : 18) to be "*a kind of first fruits of His creatures*" (comp. Eph. 1 : 12 with connec-

tion) ; (15) *the waiting position* of the martyrs (Rev. 6 : 10, 11), and of the saints (Heb. 11 : 39, 40, etc.), corresponds only with a depressed and not a triumphant condition of the Church ; (16) the Jewish tribulation, now witnessed, is to extend *down to the personal* Advent of Jesus as e.g. Matt. 24 ; Zech. 14, etc. ; (17) at the Coming of the Lord to plead with all nations, nations are represented *as unconverted* and some even *as not conversant* with the rudimentary knowledge of Him, as in Isa. 66 : 15–19 ; (18) the *continued use* of the Lord's prayer down to the end of the age ; (19) the fact that individual believers and *not nations* are elected ; (20) the believers are "*witnesses*" set to testify to the truth before others, and of these comparatively few are found, for "many are called but few are chosen," etc. ; (21) the narrowness of the way and straitness of the gate is the same *down to the Advent*, and it always remains a truth to that period that "few there be that find it ;" (22) the saving of "some" of "them that believe," of a certain pre-determined number corresponds with the difficulties often entailed upon the ministry (the Apostles not being exempt) in proclaiming the Gospel and in the facilities afforded for the same ; (23) the finishing of "the mystery of God" under the seventh trumpet (Rev. 10 : 7) includes a preceding time of trouble and wrath with a Pre-Mill. Advent (Rev. 19) and incoming Kingdom, vindicating God's procedure in redemption ; (24) the Kingdom is established at the very time "the nations were angry" (Rev. 11 : 15, 18) linked with a time of resurrection (which even some of our opponents, as Prof. Stuart, *Com. Apoc.*, admit to be literal) ; (25) the conversion of the nations is positively asserted to follow the pouring out of the judgments of God, as e.g. Rev. 15 : 4 ; Zeph. 3 : 8–20 ; (26) the conversion cannot possibly precede the persecution of the Church and the downfall of the Antichrist whose overthrow is effected by Christ and His army (comp. Props. 162, 163) : (27) Christ's delineation and opinion of the Church, taking the seven churches of the Apoc. as prophetic (comp. Seiss's *Lects. Apoc.*, No. 2, p. 174, etc.) : (28) the consternation of the world at the open Parousia of Jesus, Rev. 1 : 7 ; Rev. 6, last seal ; Matt. 24 : 30, etc. ; (29) the multitude destroyed at the Sec. Advent, Joel. 3 ; Zech. 14 ; Mich. 4 ; Rev. 14 ; Isa. 66, etc. ; (30) the continued apostatizing in the Church down to the Advent itself, 2 Thess. 2 ; Matt. 24, etc. ; (31) the comments and concessions of our opponents on such passages as 1 John 2 : 18 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 8 ; Matt. 24 ; Mark 13 ; Luke 21, etc. ; (32) Jesus, John 17 : 9 (comp. 1 John 5 : 19) not praying for the world, but for His own gathered out of the same ; (33) the parable of the sower, applying, as prominent critics of all classes affirm, to the present dispensation, indicates that down to the Second Advent there will be, as Christ portrayed, a constant rejection of the Gospel (some writers, as e.g. Brookes in *The Truth*, vol. 2, No. 12, declare that "only one fourth part of the seed will take effect," Matt. 13 : 1–23, but we are not prepared to press the parable so closely, but, to say the least, it is significant, that Jesus makes only a small proportion effectual) ; (34) the Jewish view of the non-conversion of the world previous to the personal Messianic reign, confirmed by Jesus and the Apostles in the language employed, so that all the early converted Jews retain—as we have shown—the same views ; (35) the positive evidence afforded by Isa. 66 : 19, etc., that, at the Sec. Advent, not all the world have heard the Gospel ; (36) this world not to be converted but condemned, 1 Cor. 11 : 32, owing, as numerous passages assert, to its wickedness ; (37) if the world were converted, then the saints would

reign because a world dominion would be theirs, but they reign only after the Second Advent (Prop. 154).

[1] His remarks in Sec. 149 would be beautiful if true, but being in open violation of the Spirit's delineation of this dispensation their force is marred. We reproduce it to heighten the contrast with Luke 17. For he says "this world-dominion" shall be obtained by Christians in an "increasing sway over mankind and the relations of society, until, in its final consummation, the whole earth shall own its dominion; and the Power which is to gain this world-dominion is *meekness;* the quiet might of gentleness it is with which God's Kingdom is to subjugate the world." The "rod of iron," the "treading of the wine-press," the "wrath of the Lamb," etc., which precedes the Millennial era are widely different from Neander's "meekness." The prophets are far from predicting the introduction of the Kingdom by such means for they unite in telling us that men will learn righteousness when God's judgments are in the world. The "meekness" or "gentleness" of the saints finds its culmination in martyrdom.

[2] It is nothing unusual to find sermons advocating the Whitbyan view based on texts, which *the context itself* would not allow, such as Zech. 14 : 8, as e.g. in Dr. Belfrage, Suddard's *Brit. Pulpit*, Ser. 40. Millennial predictions are thus used without the least attempt to explain the warrant for thus employing them. Let the reader compare Barnes on Isa. 45 : 23 when he has in this dispensation "all men shall have embraced the true religion," etc., with his delineation of the Millennial period in Revelation where this is contradicted. Such expositions conveniently *ignore* a class of Scripture to make out a mere human opinion.

[3] The careful student will see that this is a return to the theory of Philo (Neander's *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 65) who denied the Advent of a personal Messiah under the influence of "the idealistic element and Grecian culture," but still held that the golden age of the prophets—identified with the then existing dispensation—would be brought about "by some extraordinary appearance from heaven," etc. This indicates both how early under Alexandrian philosophy the simple idea of the covenanted Kingdom was abandoned, and vain conjectures substituted, and how such old ideas are revived and adopted. Rev. Hall in reviewing Foster's essay *On the Application of the Epithet Romantic*, expresses his satisfaction at Foster's "treating with poignant ridicule those superficial pretenders, who, without positively disavowing any dependence on divine agency, hope to reform the world, and to bring it back to a paradisiacal state, by the mere force of moral instruction." But Hall himself is not sufficiently explicit in telling us how this "divine agency," whether mediate or direct, is to perform this work, shielding himself behind generalities (such as that the work will be done by God, etc.) without any explanation of the order or manner.

[4] Therefore, we are not concerned in the controversy, respecting the success of the preaching of the Gospel (excepting in so far as it will gather the elect) as a criterion of the ultimate conversion of the world. Bolingbroke, Froude, Proudhon, M. Compte and many others may pronounce Christianity "a failure" because of its want of success; because that not a single nation or city where it flourished the most has "been effectually reformed." But this is taking it for granted that *the design* of the dispensation is *to convert* the world and not to save them that believe. It has thus far accomplished its mission. The same reply is applicable to the non-importance of the efforts made in nations now dying out (see Dr. Geekie's *Christian Missions*, and an art. in *Frazer's Mag.* or in Littell's *Liv. Age*, p. 360, 4 Ser. vol. 24 for 1872, entitled "Wanted—A Religion for the Hindoos."). For if any of the elect have been gathered, then the Divine Purpose is accomplished, and the same is true if none are gathered in that the Gospel was preached as a witness to them. Hence on the one side, such articles as that on "Christian Missions to the Heathen" (*West. Review*, Jan. 1874) or Macaulay's Essay (*Edinb. Review*, "Ranke's His. of the Popes."(taking the ground that Protestantism is gaining nothing over Catholicism, which is repeated by Bh. Spaulding of Peoria, and refuted in *Harper's Weekly*, Ap. 20th, 1878) in *Essays*, vol. 3, p. 305, etc., or Owen's *Debat.* Land, 7th chapter, or the numerous attacks on missions in various publications, or the admissions of Protestants respecting the want of success, etc., amount to nothing in a scriptural argument, for all that is alleged might be true and yet, if such is God's purpose, the conversion of the world could be effected when the time came. But on the other hand, the extravagant eulogies of missions, the arithmetical calculations presented by friends of missions, the confident predictions relating to the future, are all of no weight in a sober argument, for much might be admitted, and yet it *would fail to prove* that past and present success is a sufficient guarantee for the supposed future. What *God pur-*

poses in regard to the future must be ascertained by a comparison of His Word, and not by the want of success or by the success of His preached Word. Hennel, Renan and others, may doubt the Divine origin of Christianity when measured by its progressive advancement ; others, as Neander, etc, may claim it divine because of such progress ; while we claim it to be from God, whether progressive or not, because in adverse or prosperous circumstances, constantly calling and preparing the elect ones. With our view missionaries need not be discouraged at their lack of success (as witnessed in a conference of missionaries held in Calcutta 1855, and reported by the Calcutta *Christian Observer*) for whether few or many accept the terms of the Gospel, they are performing, successfully, the appointed work. We thank God for the success of His preached Word, a success *sufficiently commensurate* with the design of the dispensation, and *sufficiently extended* to evidence the faithfulness of His promises. We have no sympathy with e.g. the one-sided statement in *Frazer's Mag.* for 1877, which in an art. stated that " there are no converts in India, that the failure of the missionaries is complete''—to which Dr. Daly, a missionary in India replies : " there are from 7 to 800,000 baptized converts in India" (*Luth. Observer*, Oct. 11th, 1878). Since the famine large additions having been made, as one Baptist missionary alone reports several thousand lately gained. Sir Baker (*The Albert N'Yanza*, etc.) may give the most gloomy and sad details of the lack of missionary success in Africa, and pronounce the nations utterly worthless and sunken in corruption ; we may read such articles as " Indian Missions" (Littell's *Liv. Age*, vol. 25, p. 515), "Christian Missions'' (*North Brit. Review*, Aug. 1856), " Christian Missions in West Africa" (Littell's *Liv. Age*, Nov. 18th, 1876) " Struggles and Tendencies of German Protestantism" (*North Brit. Review*, Feb. 1854), Prof. Max Müller's " Lecture on Missions," and many others, and they all, whatever side they may advocate and portray, only evidence the truthfulness of our position, viz., that God instead of contemplating the conversion of nations, or of the world, *is taking out*, here and there, from among the nations, *a people for His name.*

[5] The empathic declarations of Jesus are that His testimony, His sacrifice, His promises, His Spirit, His ministry, all shall be finally—after careful and persevering presentation, after a fair test—be rejected, so that this age, like preceding ones, shall end in judgments, evoked by the continued and increasing wickedness of man. When " Westminster" (*New York Evangelist*, Jan. 2d, 1879) so confidently asserts that "the Church of Christ has not gone on from bad to worse and worst through nineteen centuries ; but with Christ its King, at its head, and the Holy Spirit in its heart, it has advanced in life and doctrine all along the line of the centuries, and will continue so to do until the end of the world,'' he simply *ignores* all history respecting the result of Constantine's conversion, the inroads of Papacy, the dark ages, the necessity of Reformation, the corruption of doctrine, and the apostatizing from the truth. We thankfully admit that Christ has always maintained a true Church in this evil world, and will continue so to do, and that its numbers have increased, but this is no reason for shutting our eyes to *the sad facts* evidenced in its history, and seen in Eccles. history.

[6] The student will observe that before Satan, " the Prince of this World," is cast down and bound (Rev. 20) direct Supernatural intervention (and not the ordinary means of grace, Gospel truth) is allied with it, as a necessary cause. This Princeship of Satan, we are told by the Spirit, is to be *specially manifested* in the last Antichrist, who shall dreadfully persecute the Church. He is overthrown, not by spiritual or Church appliances, but by the Sec. Advent of Jesus, who appears in behalf of His struggling, persecuted people. The Church's victory is given to her by him who died for her ; she can never accomplish it herself. A singular and close relationship exists, according to the Scriptures, between this world and the fallen angels. It is not necessary to enter into details, since it will be admitted—whatever theory may be entertained respecting them and Satan in particular—that man and his redemption, the restoration of the world to an Edenic condition, are in a remarkable manner the object of Satanic hate ; and that, in view of Satan's power, activity, etc., he is called " the prince of this world" (John 12 : 31, and 14 : 30) " the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4 : 4), " the power and magistracy of darkness" (Col. 1 : 13), " the rulers of the darkness of this world" (Eph. 6 : 12), " the world lying in the wicked one" (1 John 5 : 19). Indeed, as Kurtz has well expressed it, it is no " mendacious appearance of truth," no mere assumption of power, that Satan promises to Christ the kingdoms of the world, if He will but worship him, Matt. 4 : 9, for Luke 4 : 6 declares that it was delivered to him and he could give it to whom he pleased (comp Prop. 106). In view of the last declaration some theologians have contended, " that he (Satan) cannot be deprived of his dominion until deprived by a legitimate judicial decision" (see e.g. *The His. of Creation, and Doc. of Paradise, and Man the*

Image of God, by P. F. Keerl, 1861). Whatever notion may be adopted respecting the latter idea, it is evident from Eph. 2 : 2, and 6 : 12, etc., that Satanic influence and government is exerted, and that it will be exerted *down* to the Advent itself. Abundant proof is at hand to sustain this position, but our line of argument makes it unnecessary to adduce it in this connection. It may be supposed that John 12 : 31 is opposed to this, but as all commentators (Barnes, etc.) admit, the casting out of Satan was not then performed, has not been down to the present day, and will not be until the Second Advent or judgment. They agree that the provision was made for the casting out, and which so insures it, that owing to its certainty the future is spoken of as present. Hence the doom of Satan and the wicked is united, and both experience the same fate at the same time. Hence Satan is and remains, the prince, ruler, god of this world *down* to the Second Coming of the Lord, when he is cast out (Rev. 20).

[1] The reader of the Bible will find that the Scriptures predict at the closing of this dispensation—as introductory to the glorious reign of Christ on earth, as preliminary to bringing the nations under the sway and blessings of the Kingdom—a time of Justice, made necessary by the actual development of human depravity ; a stern administration of justice, which shall overwhelm the wicked with confusion, shame and destruction. After wonderful mercy and long forbearance, inflexible justice, with its fearful judgments executed, shall be adminstered over the nations, over the Antichrist and his armies. A thousand prophecies unerringly point to this period. Now the Gospel message is one of peace, of mercy, of continued patience, and of tendered love, and this must continue until "the day of vengeance" has arrived. This teaches us two things incompatible with a conversion of the world prior to the Advent : (1) That nations are in such a state of open rebellion and wickedness, that such a time of justice must come ; and (2) that such a time of vengeance with its direful inflictions, indicates that God will employ something beside the Gospel to bring the world to a dutiful consideration and obedience.

Obs. 7. Our argument might by some be deemed incomplete if we did not, at least briefly, indicate how the passages usually quoted in favor of the conversion of the world are to be explained. 1. The favorite text of many is found in Ps. 2 : 8 "*Ask of Me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.*" This wrested from its connection, is supposed to be conclusive proof. But leaving the context and parallel passages to have due force, it is found that this is fulfilled, (a) *when* "*the nations rage*" (comp. Rev. 11 : 18) ; (b) *when* a confederation of "*the kings of the earth*" *and* "*the rulers*" is formed against Christ (comp. Rev. 19 : 19) ; (c) *when* the scorn and derision, the wrath and sore displeasure of the Lord shall be manifested (comp. wrath of, Rev. 11 : 18 and 14 : 10, etc.) ; (d) *when* the Mighty King shall be at Jerusalem (comp. Zech. 14 : 4, 5, etc.) ; (e) *when* instead of being converted, "*Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron ; Thou shalt dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel ;* (f) and *when* "*the Son*" *shall be* "*angry*" and, if not repentant, they shall "*perish.*" It is folly to make this ruling with a rod of iron, *a-converting* process in the light of such parallel Scripture as Rev. 19 : 15 and 2 : 27 which not only locate *the time* of its fulfilment to be *after* the Advent, but express the process as one *terrible in its results* to the enemies of God thus threatened. 2. Another, often quoted, text is in Isa. 2 : 18, 20 "*And the idols He shall utterly abolish.*" "*In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats.*" But the context *unmistakably shows that this is the result* of the fearful manifestations of God's judgments. Particular emphasis (as if the Spirit foresaw the deceptive interpretation fastened upon the passage) is laid upon the fact (repeated) that this is done "*for fear of the Lord and for the glory of the Lord*" ("*before the terrible look of Jehovah,*" so Delitzsch, with which comp. Rev. 19 : 12, etc.), "*when He ariseth to shake*

terribly the earth" (or, "*to put the earth into terror*," so Delitzsch, with which comp. Rev. 1 : 7, etc.). It is simply *a perversion* of language to make that which plainly describes *a period of terror and awe* to mean the gracious influences of spiritual converting power, etc. 3. Still another frequently employed is found in Isa. 11 : 9 "*The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.*" The context informs us *when* this shall be fulfilled. In the 4th verse it is said : "*He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked.*" Now this instead of being a converting process is described in Rev. 19 : 15 *at* the Advent of the King of kings, *as an act of vengeance*, for "*out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations ; and He shall rule them with a rod of iron and He treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God*" (see what follows). The Spirit thus locates *the period* of fulfilment, and to confirm it gives us a beautiful Millennial prediction (vers. 6, 7, 8) which is repeated in Isa. 65 : 17–25 as taking place *when* "the New Heaven and the New Earth" are created (see Prop. 148). 4. Isa. 25 : 6–12 ; Micah 4 : 1–4 ; Isa. 2 : 2–4 or portions of it, are quoted as sustaining a conversion of the world *prior* to the Advent, but that this is a perversion of these Scriptures is evident from the context and texts. For these passages *stand related* to the terrible punishment inflicted upon the kings of the earth, the resurrection of the saints (as e.g. Isa. 25 : 8 comp. with 1 Cor. 15 : 54) the restoration of the Jews, the reigning of the Messiah in Mt. Zion, the removal of all suffering, war, etc. (comp. with Rev. 21 : 4, etc.). They fall into *correspondence* with numerous Propositions already presented. 5. Isa. 60 and 54 are largely appropriated in behalf of the Whitbyan theory, but how erroneously can be seen in Props. 148, 151, 146 and 118. 6. Dan. 2 and 7 are also thus applied, but wrongfully as is evident from Props. 121, 123, 126, 127, 128, etc.[1] 7. Zech. 2 : 11 "*And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day and shall be my people ;*" Zech. 9 : 10 "*He shall speak peace to the heathen, and His dominion shall be from sea even to sea and from the river even to the ends of the earth ;*" Zech. 8 : 20–23 and Zech. 14 : 9 "*The Lord shall be King over all the earth ; in that day there shall be one Lord and His name One.*" But if we allow the same Spirit which gives such gracious promises *to locate their fulfilment*, it will be found to be *at* the restoration of the Jewish nation *when* the fearful vengeance of God is poured out upon its enemies who have oppressed it—*when* the Lord will come and dwell again with man, "*choosing again Jerusalem*" and "*inheriting Judah His portion in the holy land*"—*when* "*His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mt. of Olives,*" "*the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with Thee,*" and the wicked shall be utterly destroyed out of the earth and "the left of all the nations" shall come and worship the mighty King. 8. Zeph. 3 : 9 promising the bestowal "*to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent,*" is realized only *when* as context shows, "*I* (*the Lord*) *rise up to the prey ; for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the Kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger ; for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy.*" The context points to this preceding vengeance, and then to the restoration and safety of the Jewish nation, and to the dwelling of "the King of Israel, even the Lord in the midst of thee." 9. The parable of the Leaven is a favorite with many, but we only need to remark that whatever interpreta-

tion is given to it, one thing is certain that *it does not contradict* the parables of the tares and wheat and of the drag net (see Prop. 108). The small, definite measure in which the leaven is placed shows that it is not applicable to the world. 10. Isa. 27 : 6 "*Israel shall blossom and bud and fill the face of the world with fruit.*" But this follows the destruction of "the Leviathan," corresponding with numerous other predictions, such as Rev. 19 ; Joel 3, etc. 11. Rom. 11, has been examined in detail (Props. 112, 121, etc.), and the conversion of the world is shown *to be identified with* the ending of the times of the Gentiles, the Advent of Jesus (verse 26 comp. with Matt. 23 : 37–39 ; Zech. 12 : 10, etc.) and the restoration of the Jewish nation. 12. Isa. 59 : 19 "*So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west and His glory from the rising of the sun. When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him.*" Having already shown that the Spirit has worked in all dispensations and that His most glorious displays belong to the coming age (Prop. 171), it is only necessary to direct attention to the context of this passage. This state of things predicted is *preceded* by the "coming in of the enemy as a flood" (viz. the last great Antichristian confederation) and the Coming of the Lord clad in "*the garments of vengeance*" and pouring out "*fury to His adversaries, recompense to His enemies.*"[2] "*The Redeemer shall come to Zion,*" and then the Spirit and truth shall evermore remain with the Jewish nation. The outpouring of the Spirit, Joel 2 : 28–32 connected with Joel 3, is *allied with* the day of the Lord, the presence of the King, the overthrow of confederated enemies and the glory of restoration, which is abundantly confirmed by various parallel passages. 13. The position occupied by some (as e.g. Stearns, *Proph. Times*, Dec. 1866, p. 186) that the Coming of Christ and the outpouring of the Spirit "are one and the same thing," needs no refutation in the light of such declarations contained in John 16 : 7, Luke 24 : 49, John 14 : 16, Acts 2 : 33, etc. 14. Rom. 5 : 20 "*Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound,*" is adduced to prove the world's conversion before the Advent, but it proves *too much* for if the deduction drawn from it is just, then the Jewish nation instead of being rejected, etc., ought to have been converted, and so all other nations who have heard the Gospel. This passage only shows the marvellous grace of God toward sinners, the freeness and largeness of profferred salvation, but this grace, such salvation, *can be refused.* 15. Ps. 72 : 7, 8, 9, 10 expressive of a world-wide dominion, takes place when the King judges (Prop. 132) the people, having broken "in pieces the oppressor," having "come down," and the nations are situated as represented in Isa. 60, and Rev. 21. 16. The ending of the Priesthood of Christ (and hence no more salvation, etc., for the race) with this age, has been noticed, Prop. 155, etc., as opposed to Scripture. 17. The non-perpetuation of the race (and hence no more probation, etc.) at the Sec. Advent received due attention under Prop. 152. 18. The commission as given in Mark 16 : 15, "*Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature*" (or, as Sirr, Lit. vol. 3, p. 151, "going into the whole world announce the glad tidings for the whole creation") and Matt. 28 : 19 "*Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them*" etc., is supposed by many to embrace the conversion of the world. But it says *nothing* of such conversion ; only enjoining *the duty of preaching the Gospel,* and plainly declaring that only some shall be saved in the attached language : "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned.*"[3] 19.

Eaton and others lay much stress upon the cosmopolitan nature of the doctrines of the Gospel, their adaptability to all people, etc. But this does not prove that they will be universally received, seeing that with all their suitableness to make man happy, etc., *the large number* have thus far rejected them, and that even communities and countries that once possessed the Gospel (as Asia Minor, Egypt, etc.) have it only to-day by renewed missionary effort. However well adapted to promote man's welfare, man, owing to the duties enjoined and self-denial required, *can reject it.* 20. The same is true of the argument based on the permanency and duration of Christianity, this only indicating the constant carrying out of the Divine purpose *in saving some.* The present arrangement is wholly dependent upon the Will of God, and what that Will contemplates in reference *to continuation,* etc., must be ascertained, not from the establishment and perpetuation *thus far* of the present ordering, but from *the design* He has in view respecting it. 21. Finally, some refer us to Matt. 24 : 14 "*This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations,*" etc. Without showing how largely this has been already done (even in apostolic days, Col. 1 : 6, 23, etc.) without the conversion of the world following, it is sufficient to say that the passage itself *limits* this preaching "*for a witness unto all nations.*" That is, the truth is to be testified to whether men accept of it or not, so that when God's judgments come a reasonable and seasonable warning shall be given. It is only *a witness* (comp. Lange's *Com. loci,* and remarks of Alford, Nast, Gerlach, etc.) and, if we were to take the limited sense[4] applied to it by Barnes (*Com. loci*) was amply fulfilled before the destruction of Jerusalem. Extending it down to the end of this age it is still *a witness* for the truth, implying by the very phraseology that *some reject* the Gospel. So that even Chrysostom on this passage says: "Attend with care to what is read. He said not *when it hath been believed by all men,* but when it hath been preached to all. For this cause he also said, '*for a witness to all nations,*' to show that He doth not wait for men *to believe,* and then for Him to come, since that phrase '*for a witness*' hath this meaning—for accusation, for reproof, for condemnation of those *that have not believed.*" Horne (*Introd.,* vol. 1, p. 137), in answer to an objection drawn from the possession of the Gospel by countries that afterward fell into gross unbelief, aptly remarks: "we conceive that the prophecies are fulfilled when all parts of the world shall have had *the offer* of Christianity."[5]

[1] Thus Gregory (*Four Gospels,* p. 124), makes Matt. 28 : 16–20 to include "the spiritual conquest of the world." But we need not be surprised at such an interpretation when he has it verified in the prophetic announcements of Dan. 2 : 44, 45, and 7 : 27, etc. Multitudes arrive at the same illogical and unscriptural conclusion.

[2] So in Isa. 62 : 10, *when* the standard is to be lifted up for the people, it is linked with the Advent of the Saviour, and as this Advent is described as a Coming in vengeance and to recompense and to deliver (so especially next ch.) it corresponds with other Scripture. A standard is emblematic of the gathering and war then resulting, and is engrafted in the Mill. descriptions as in Isa. 49 : 22.

[3] As the commission seems to be the main proof of various writers, a few words may be added. If the commission is to be pressed to such an extent, then the same principle would have the world converted in the days of the Apostles, Col. 1 : 23 ; Rom. 10 : 18 ; Rom 1 : 8 ; Acts 26 : 16–18. Those to whom the commission was given never stated that its intention was to convert the world by preaching the Gospel. When explaining the object and results of their preaching, it is simply that they "are ambassadors for Christ" praying us to be "reconciled to God" and that "the preaching of the cross is to them that

perish foolishness, but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God." Therefore they declare, "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching *to save them that believe*" and that they are "made all things to all men that they might by all means *save some.*" Compare the language of Clement, *Epis. to Cor.* ch. 5, Eusebius B. 2, ch. 3, and Theodoret (Bh. Newton's *Diss.*, vol. 2, p. 46), Horne's *Introd.*, p. 131, Justin, *Dial. with Trypho*, p. 345, Irenæus *Cont. Hœres*, I. 3, Tertullian *Adv. Judœos*, c. 7 and 14, showing by usage that the word "all," etc., is not to be pressed (Col. 1 : 6, etc.), to a universality embracing literally all individuals or even nations (simply denoting a general diffusion of the truth) which led Neander (*His. Ch. Church*, vol. 1, p. 183), to say that Paul was mistaken because he could not "estimate correctly the population of the globe at that period." That it has its limitations is seen from the fact that millions have died, since the Gospel was given, who never as much as heard of it. Dr. Brown (*Ch. Sec. Com.*, p. 317), takes, in order to make out an argument against us, *an unwarranted liberty* with Matt. 28 : 19, reading : "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations." This undue liberty is seen (1) by ignoring the limitation given to this commission by other Scripture ; (2) by confining the discipleship to nations, instead of individuals out of nations ; (3) by rejecting the overwhelming testimony of critics, versions, commentators, etc., which limits the idea to teaching and making disiples out of all nations, i.e., excluding none from the Gospel ; (4) by extreme rigidity of application, he would make the Apostles themselves disobedient to the commission and practically failing in carrying it out ; (5) by ignoring the past, which has failed to disciple a single nation ; (6) and by ignoring the future which shows the nations undiscipled at Sec. Advent.

[4] Attention is called to the contradictions in which our opponents involve themselves when quoting this passage of Matt. 24 against us. Nearly all tell us that Matt. 24 refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. But observe that if this is so, *then* they have no right to quote one verse in the same connection, the preaching of the Gospel, against us, because *in consistency* with their own interpretation it must relate only to the time *previous* to that destruction. Again, if they thus limit it in time, as consistent application from their standpoint demands, *then* according to their idea of its meaning, comprehending the conversion of the world, it never was fulfilled, and Jesus failed in His prophecy. The Gospel in the early ages was widely disseminated as a witness, and so late a writer as Arnobius Jr. (A.D. 460) on Ps. 147 (quoted by *Lond. Quart. Review*, in an art. on "The Anc. Brit. Church,") remarks : "So swiftly runneth the Word of God, that whereas for so many thousand years He was known in Judea alone, now within a few years He has been revealed to the Indians on the East and to the Britons on the West." Dr. Leask has conclusively shown that Matt. 24, in view of the warnings, cautions, and events given by Jesus, which extend down to the Second Advent, positively forbids the conversion of the world prior to it (*Proph. Times*, vol. 4, No. 12). Many writers of the greatest ability affirm the same, and that this melancholy prophecy, unbroken by a single ray of Whitbyan prediction—now so popular—incontestibly proves no Millennium previous to the Advent. (Comp. Prop. 174.)

[5] Dr. Brown (*Com.*, Mark 13 : 10) makes this "witness" to be one of warning. Books have appeared with the significant title : *The Christian Ministry, (as) the Divinely Appointed Agency to reform the World.* Christ's work is thus specifically deputed to the ministry. It is well, briefly, to notice the Scripture statements on the subject : (1) that they are to preach to all nations, none excluded, Matt. 28 : 18–20, etc. ; (2) that some will believe and others will not, 2 Thess. 2 : 10–12 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 21 ; 2 Cor. 4 : 3, etc. ; (3) that they are sent as Jesus was sent, John 20 : 21 ; (4) that they labor for the elect's sake, 2 Tim. 2 : 10, etc. ; (5) that down to the Sec. Advent they must suffer for the truth's sake, 2 Tim. 3 : 11, 12 ; 1 Tim. 4 : 10, etc. ; (5) that their message can be received in vain, 2 Cor. 6 : 1, etc. ; (6) that in continued opposition to such a ministry a false one shall also exist, 1 Tim. 4 : 1–3 ; 2 Tim. 3 : 5 ; 2 Thess. 2 ; Acts 20 : 30 ; 2 Cor. 11 : 13, etc. ; (7) that many shall after their ministry be themselves rejected, Matt. 7 : 22, 23, etc. ; (8) that they shall always be despised by some, 2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4 ; 1 Thess. 4 : 8, etc. Now the divine portraiture is *very different* from the pleasing but misleading picture presented in such works. On the other hand, when Rev. Dr. Ewer, of Christ Church, New York, in his discourses on the "Failure of Protestantism," makes much of not holding the masses, of retrogressions, etc., (and hence advocates a return to the high hierarchical system) he simply fails to recognize *the scriptural design* of this dispensation (which has been carried on without a failure), and substitutes his own ideas in its place.

Obs. 8. On a subject of this kind, in view of the influence exerted, it may be in place to add the testimony of some additional witnesses to

aid the student in forming a judgment respecting the same. Having already alluded to the early Church, Reformers and Confessions, the declaration of the Latter Confession of Helvitia (1566) may be annexed. After, in the eleventh article, saying that Jesus shall return again "*even then when wickedness shall chiefly reign in the world,*" etc., the Confessors proceed: "Moreover we condemn the Jewish dreams, *that before the day of judgment there shall be a golden world in the earth;* and that the godly shall possess the Kingdoms of the world, their wicked enemies being trodden under foot: for the evangelical truth, Matt. 24 and 25, and Luke 21, and the Apostolic doctrine in the 2d Epis. to the Thess. 2, and in the 2d Epis. to Tim. 3 and 4, are found *to teach far otherwise.*" Olshausen, *Com.* vol. 1, p. 117, and in various places is very decided in rejecting the Whitbyan theory, advocating "*that with the arrival of this reign of peace* there will be connected on the one hand, *the appearance of Jesus Christ and a resurrection of many saints and pious men,* and on the other, *a previous mighty struggle* on the part of evil," etc. Nissen in his *Lectures on Luther's Smaller Catechism* on the doctrine of the Millennium, pointedly rejects the conversion of the world before the personal Advent of Jesus, saying: "It is *a false widespread* idea to which we yield quite too readily, that the Gospel once introduced into the world and embodied in the Church, must now even more and more impregnate and pervade everything with its blessing: state, art, science, and civilization; and that just in this way a universal renovation of the world is to be brought about. But the Holy Scriptures *everywhere and throughout,* in all the prophecies, as well in the Old Test. as in the New, *present a very different conception of things.*" He advocates the continued existence of evil powers, which shall culminate in intense hatred toward the Church and the exaltation of Antichrist, *until* Christ personally comes, remarking: "When the pride of Antichrist, and the self-security and fearful sins of the world, as the straits and griefs of God's people, have reached their highest point, *then shall Jesus Christ be revealed from heaven, to make an end of the course of this world and to establish His glorious Kingdom upon the earth.*" Dean Alford's (*Crit. Com. on New Test.*) sentiments are well known, and hence we only need to quote one passage illustrative of the same: "*The Lord will come in person to this earth; His risen elect will reign here with Him. This is my firm persuasion,* and not mine alone, but that of multitudes of Christ's waiting people, as it was that of His Primitive Apostolic Church, *before controversy blinded the eyes of the Fathers to the light of prophecy.*" Dr. Marsh, after many years of prophetic study, declared (*Mem.* by his daughter): "The complete victory of truth I do not expect *until* the Second Advent of our blessed Lord. I have *no hope* of a general or universal spread of Christian knowledge *till He comes.*" "When He has taken out of the Gentiles a people for His name and called a remnant of the Jews according to the election of grace, *then He will return and convert the Jewish nation, put down all rule and all authority and power opposed to His Gospel, and cause the knowledge of Himself to cover the earth.* So I read in every passage of Holy Writ, and long for the day; for then Satan will be bound and Creation will cease to groan." "Not till *then* will the enemy be bound and error be banished, and Jew and Gentile form one flock, under one Shepherd." Such extracts might be multiplied from Lange's *Com.* (Especially from the Expos. of 1st and 2d Thess. and 1st and 2d Peter by Dr. Lillie), Bengel's

Gnomon, Ryle's *Expos. Thoughts on the Gospels*, Tholuck's *Writings*, Kelly's *Commentaries*, Auberlen's *Works*, Pridham *On the Psalms*, Jones's *Notes*, Demarest's *Com. Second Peter*, Delitzsch's *Works*, and many others,[1] indicative both of the retention of the primitive faith by some able men, and that, on the score of advocacy, it has *no lack* of talented defenders. Indeed the latter is so much the case that Dr. Ed. Beecher, a sympathizer with the Whitbyan theory, calls attention to the fact in the *Independent* of Aug. 24th, 1871, and declares that "*their power seems to be increasing*," that "the more recent Commentaries are tending to undermine the views" of the Whitbyan hypothetical advocates, and adds: "*this is true of Alford, Ellicott, Lange and his co-laborers, especially Drs. Lillie, Auberlen, and Riggenbach.* To these we must add the writings of English and American Millenarians, the older and the more recent. And there is at present *no adequate counterpoise* to the weight of the authority of the commentators whom we have mentioned."[2] This frank confession is followed by warnings to urge his party to renewed efforts to meet this "undermining" process. Alas, prophecy teaches that the multitude will only too eagerly follow the same. Very few, comparatively, are willing to investigate the subject as Bh. Henshaw, who says: (*Epis. Recorder*, 1845) "Although we *have formerly advocated* the popular theory (viz. Whitbyan) ourselves—the common belief that there will be a conversion of all nations to the faith of Christ, and a state of universal peace and holiness throughout the world for the space of a thousand years *before* the Sec. Advent of our Lord, *is, to our view, utterly irreconcilable* with what the Scriptures teach." Many too, convinced of the untenableness of the prevailing opinion and of the soundness of our deductions, instead of proclaiming their views and enjoying the happy consciousness of having warned and encouraged the Church (as e.g. Rev. John King Lord, on his death-bed) hold them back from the public, and at the close of life express their regret for such reticence (as e.g. the talented Rev. Hall, see Duffield Diss. on Proph. p. 259).

[1] For the sake of the student who desires to prosecute researches in this direction, we append a few more references. Dr. Seiss's essay *A Question in Eschatology*, Shimeall's *I will come Again* and *Reply to Prof. Shedd*, *The Literalist* 5 vols. 8vo, containing writings from Brooks, McNeile, Noel, Bickersteth, Anderson, Cunninghame, Cox, Sirr, Habershon, Thorpe, Woodward and others, Bloomsbury *Lent Lectures*, 10 vols. Duffield's *Diss. on Proph.*, Lord's *Coming and Reign of Christ*, Ramsey's *Messiah's Reign*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, *Time of the End* by a Congregationalist, Hasting's *Signs of the Times*, Brookes's *Maranatha*, expose the unscriptural character of the Whitbyan theory. The same is true of the works of H. and A. Bonar, Mede, Begg, Bh. and Sir I. Newton, Birks, Keith, the Duke of Manchester, Sir E. Denny, Byant, Cumming, Frere, Ogilvy, Leask, Dallas, Henshaw, Oswald, Maitland, Auberlen, Luthardt, Heubner, Lord, Von Gerlach, Ward, and, in brief, a large number of Millenarian writers. See extended lists given in Seiss's *Last Times*, Ap., Bickersteth's *Guide*, etc. For additional commentaries and expositions bearing on the subject the following can be advantageously consulted, Greswell's *Expos. Parables*, etc., McIntosh's *Coms.*, Bonar's *Com. on Psalms*, Tregelles *on Daniel*, Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.* Auberlen's *Proph. of Daniel*, Lord's *Apoc.*, Roos's *Daniel.*, etc., Snell *on Rev.*, Gill's *Com.*, etc. For more fugitive references and expressions see Dr. Giesy's sermon (*Proph. Times*, Feb., 1871), John Foster's opinion (*Life*, vol. 1, p. 91), Chalmers's *Sabbath Readings*, p. 311, on Ps. 50 : 1–6 ; Ps. 68 : 18-35, and *Evidences*, vol. 2, p. 372, etc., the *Confession of Faith* presented to Charles II. and signed by John Bunyan and others (Crosby's *His. Bap.*, Ap.), Fletcher's *Letter on the Prophecies*, (dated A.D. 1775, *Works*, vol. 10), Hewitson's *Memoirs*, p. 86, etc., Gilfillan's *Bards of the Bible*, p. 348, etc., Sabine's *Letter to the Rev. Dr. Raffles author of the Jubilee Hymn*," A.D. 1846, Bhs. McIlvaine and Hopkins cited in Winthrop's able *Letters*, Heber's *Hymns*, Oetinger's *Sermons*, Spurgeon's *Sermons*, vol. 7, p. 373, Spaulding's *Lec.*, pp. 45, 51, 214, etc., Spencer's

Conformity to the Augs. Confession, John Wesley's *Works*, New York ed., vol. 5, pp. 726–7 and vol. 6, p. 743, Charles Wesley's *Hymns*, Toplady's *Sers.*, B. 3, p. 470, Tyng's *Lectures*, Tholuck's essay *Evang. Theol. in Germany*, and Christlieb's *Essay on Infidelity*, and several other papers in Proceedings of Evang. Alliance, N. Y., 1873, indicating prevalence and continuation of wickedness, etc., etc. Last, but not least, such works as Van Oosterzee's *Christian Dogmatics*, Breckenridge's *Knowledge of God, Subjectively Considered*, p. 677, Duffield's *Sermon* (delivered at the opening of the Synod of New Jersey, 1866), and his *Essay* in *Pre-Mill. Essays*, p. 405, etc., Lillie's *Miss. Sermon* (deliv. at the Synod of New York, 1865), etc.

[2] This counterpoise is sought in issuing new editions of some older commentaries (Scott, Henry, Doddridge, etc.), in circulating commentaries of a popular cast (as Barnes's, the Amer. Tract Society's Notes, etc.,) and in efforts to produce new ones (as The Speaker's, etc.) But unfortunately none of these allow *our reasons* to appear for our interpretation, and *then* present reasons why they should not be accepted, excepting such as they suppose are easily refuted.

Obs. 9. Attention may be appropriately called to a number of particulars connected with this subject. 1. Various parties have noticed that the very name given (in Greek) to the Church, is significant of *a part being taken from the whole.* "Ekklesia," as critics assure us, denotes a calling forth *out of, or from among*, others, meaning therefore *a body separated* from others or the mass; these form the company of believers, the assemblage of the faithful. Therefore, the name chosen to designate God's people in this dispensation *being applicable down to the end of the age*, itself intimates that it always, to the end of this dispensation, will only compose *a portion taken out* of the nation. This is confirmed by the applied terms "*elect*" "*chosen*," etc., which in themselves convey the idea *that others remain outside* of this favored body. 2. The preaching of the Gospel and the acceptance of the same has always more or less been accompanied by *the division* predicted by Christ, Luke 12 : 51–53, and *the hatred* prophesied John 15 : 19. Innumerable instances from the days of the apostles to the present evidence its continued truthfulness. But comparatively few families are all believers, while no city, town or village, however great the advantages but has its unbelievers, and such in the majority. The cities, too, that have been the most highly favored by able preaching, possessing the highest talent of the Church, and being the centres of great missionary societies, have an overwhelming *majority* on the side of evil, thus teaching us that the true sons and daughters of God always, in comparison with the mass around them, compose a "*small flock.*"[1] 3. The conversion of the world, at some period of time, is most certain, for God *has sworn* to bring it about. Thus e.g. Isa. 45 : 23, "*I have sworn by Myself, the Word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.*" But in strict accordance with our argument, Paul quotes this Rom. 14 : 10, 11 as applicable to the time *when* Christ is seated upon the judgment seat or throne *after* His Advent (see Props. 176, 132 and 133).[2] 4. Taking into consideration the efforts made at Christianizing the nations, the amount of success, the losses and retrogressions, the millions in heathen darkness, the millions only nominally Christian, the millions in unbelief, the appliances of evil, etc., we are not surprised that some advocating the Whitbyan opinion, express themselves (misconceiving the design of the dispensation), as Dr. Lyman Beecher (Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, p. 9.), "It would take *to all eternity* to bring the Millennium *at the rate* that modern revivals progress." Dr. Leask states in *Happy Years*

that an eminent missionary made a calculation how long it would take the world to be converted and gave "as the result the astounding answer of *a million* of years." Numerous calculations, some exceedingly sanguine, exist, but the Millennium is *not dependent* upon any such anticipated results. It solely depends upon *the number* of the elect that God has determined to gather out, and *when* the number is completed, no sooner or later, *then* will it come. Hence missionaries, ministers, and others, engaged in proclaiming the Gospel have *no reason to be discouraged* at the apparent want of success; for whether men accept or reject the truth, the appointed work of procuring these elect ones is going on, and also that of making the Gospel a witness.[3] 5. No important creed or confession of faith has incorporated the Whitbyan hypothesis, while a number of them employ language which is *irreconcilable* with its adoption. This indicates both the more ancient faith and the more recent origin of the prevailing view; and, may we add, the modern departure from the spirit of the older confessions,[4] 6. The limited chronological periods, no matter from what point we may reckon their commencement, are opposed to the Whitbyan theory. For they are connected in their ending with events which *can only transpire* at the Advent of Christ, such as e.g. the resurrection in Daniel 12; Rev. 11, etc. These periods embrace the depression of the Church under Antichristian influence. 7. The declarations respecting an incoming dispensation are *ignored* by the advocates of this theory, as e.g. the facts adduced under Props. 133, 137, 138, 139, 140, and 143. 8. This is *a subject of prophecy*. When the pulpit, platform, and press describe, in glowing terms and with beautiful figures of speech, *the Whitbyan golden age*, few men stop to think that the speaker or writer is entering the region of *unfulfilled prophecy*. The stale objection that prophecy can only be understood *after* its fulfilment, *levelled against us*, is no more thought of, and the *utmost positiveness* is manifested. Such, however, are *predicting* and as the prediction happens *to harmonize* with the popular view, no feeling is excited against it, but it is greeted with the heartiest approbation. We could point to numerous, and really finely executed, sermons, hymns, etc., on this subject that are highly esteemed but which do not contain *one solitary scripturally derived proof* in favor of the position maintained, and yet they are *favorites*. Just so soon as our view is stated and defended, *then*, owing to its opposition to popular conceptions, and the humilating facts connected therewith, it is immediately felt to be one relating *to unfulfilled prophecy*, and some—overlooking their own confident entrance into the identical field of inquiry—are ready *to censure us* for discussing the matter. Wisdom and prudence dictate that *both* are dealing with the future, and as that future can *only* be ascertained in so far as God has revealed it, he *only* is correct, whose view is *the most solidly based on the Word of God*. 9. *How widely* the two views *differ* in the instruction which they impart to the people. The one tells them that they are to look for peace and prosperity; for wars to cease; for a universal spread of holiness and happiness—in brief—for "*the year of Jubilee*" *to come in this dispensation* through the preaching of the Gospel. The other *flatly contradicts* this, saying that instead of peace and prosperity to the nations of the earth, they must expect the future to bring forth war, distress, and perplexity; that unbelief and wickedness will exist down to Christ's Advent and just previous to His Coming will greatly increase; that instead of happiness widely extended and universally diffused,

we must await, before the Mill. age is introduced, *the most fearful calamities* to befall the earth. The Whitbyan view takes the Millennial predictions and applies them *to this dispensation*, promising that, by the Gospel and the outpouring of the Spirit, evils shall be rooted out and "the glory of the latter day be brought about." The Primitive Church view makes *no such vain promises*, telling the people that apostatizing from the truth shall prevail; that the awful scenes predicted by Daniel, Isaiah, and John must first be witnessed; that the time of trouble to come upon the nations mentioned by all the prophets must first be realized, and the last great earthquake convulsing the earth must first be felt; that the terrors and the joys of the Second Advent, the fearful tribulation, the terrible treading of the wine-press, the dreadful supper of human flesh *must first come to pass* before this world is ever converted to God, and King Jesus will introduce the promised blessedness. The *contrast* between the two views is great. The one prophesies "*smooth things*," administering to the Church, what Mather called "*the sleeping medicine*," until, as predicted, not merely the foolish but also the wise virgins slumber and sleep not looking for the Coming of the Bridegroom. It lauds and magnifies the Church until it deems itself "*rich and increased in goods and having need of nothing*," not knowing that it is "*poor and blind and naked;*" for ignoring faith in the Coming of the Master, and in the events connected therewith, it is *utterly unprepared*. It places that Advent into an indefinite, distant future, that it loses all *practical* force. Denying the literal fulfilment of the covenants, and of prophecy based upon the same; rejecting the power of a first resurrection, and the tremendous issues related thereto; refusing to warn the people; putting death in the place of the Advent, etc., it soothes nations, corporations, bodies ecclesiastical, and individuals into the complacent and fatal idea that present institutions, means, etc., are *to be prepetuated for ages* to the gradual and final exaltation of the race.[5] The other prophesies *both* joyful and terrible things—*joyful* to him who can embrace "the blessed hope," but *fearful* to him who cannot hope for salvation when Christ comes. It faithfully, amid compassionate expressions of pity and affected wit at its ignorance and folly, warns the Church and world of coming events, exhorts to be constantly watchful and prepare for the return of the Lord, and encourages the faithful to observe the thickening signs of approaching deliverance, and "*to look up and lift up their heads for their Redemption draweth nigh.*" It tells, pointing to Holy Writ for proof, them that Jesus and His co-heirs are to introduce, after smiting and overthrowing all confederations of wickedness, the knowledge and glory of the Lord which is to fill the whole earth, earnestly cautioning every one to stand in awe and sin not lest they perish under coming wrath. 10. Notice, briefly, *the individual responsibility* we are under in holding the one or the other of these views. If accountable to God for our doctrinal position, and the manner in which we understand and treat His Word, *especially is this true of a doctrine involving such important matter and results.* If our doctrine is wrong, we are held responsible for it, and must render an account for holding it. But in the last day, we *at least* can put in *two pleas* before the Judge that would largely palliate our error, viz., that our doctrine was contained *in the plain grammatical sense* of the Word; and that we injured no man in urging him *to live soberly, righteously and godly*, because of an impending Advent, because of frightful judgments soon to be poured out, because the

coveted first resurrection was nigh at hand, because the wicked would be destroyed, this earth be renewed and Christ and His saints reign. We can justly claim that *the entire tendency* of our view, thus given in the literal sense of Scripture, was to preserve men *from sin* that they might inherit with Christ and participate in His glory. But what if our doctrine is true and the opposite is an error? Will not God hold such accountable for the error entertained? Undoubtedly so, as Jesus Himself declared Matt. 5 : 19. See the tendency of the doctrine as noticed in Obs. 9, and consider that if those fearful scenes of tribulation shall come upon the Church, as predicted, *then multitudes that have been deceived by "the peace and safety" cry*, when aroused from their Whitbyan dream of security by the persecuting and bloody demands of a culminated Antichrist, *will accuse the ministry of having blinded them to the truth.* To lead men on and on by *a false hope until it gives place to appalling despair and martyrdom under Antichristian power is no trifling affair.* Alas, that good and learned men should engage in such a work, urging on by their vivid and flattering portrayals of the conversion of the world, the even now generally accepted opinion, "*My Lord delayeth His Coming,*" etc. The best of motives, and the plea of ignorance, may indeed lessen to some extent the weight of censure, but the plainness with which such things are recorded in the Word, the testimony on this subject in the Church, and the apparent neglect of a careful comparison of Scripture bearing upon it, do not clear the parties who entertain and proclaim it. In *kindness*, this personal accountability is presented for consideration, in the light of such passages as Ezek. 33 : 6, Acts 20 : 26, 27, etc., illustrative of *the duty* of proclaiming the truth as God has given it.[6] 11. The advocacy of the early Church view by so many and prominent men in the Church, thus bringing the subject to the attention of believers, is *not merely a coincidence*, but, if we read Providence correctly, *just what we ought to anticipate.* As the prophetical periods are drawing to their close and the time is rapidly approaching for the astounding events preceding and accompanying the Advent of the mighty King, *it is reasonable* that God should revive in His believing people *the ancient faith* to serve both as a source of warning and encouragement. 12. The pervading extent and intrenchment of the Whitbyan hypothesis in the Church is a matter of amazement. *Modern* in its conception, yet with such favor has it been received that it is firmly planted in the minds and hearts of *the multitude.* Our view is regarded under its influence, with *such disdain* that thousands do not consider *it worthy of serious attention;* that few papers venture to publish our communications; that few pulpits are willingly opened to admit discussion; that books, hymn books, etc., favoring our doctrine, in reprints have the same omitted; and that we are classed with heretics, fanatics, etc. 13. But this is precisely the state of things that we *ought to expect to find* as the end draws nigh. If the entire Church would receive our view, if it were the great popular doctrine, all recognizing it as scriptural, etc., *then indeed we might doubt its truthfulness.* For one of the evidences that the world will not be converted before the Advent, is *the predicted sign* that the Church, under the influence of delusive hope (just such an one as the Whitbyan theory presents) will be *in a state of fancied security and prosperity not looking for the Advent of Christ.* Relying upon the Prophetic Word, it would be foolishness for us to imagine that our doctrine should become *the popular one,* like the Whitbyan.

All that we anticipate is, that it will be received by *the faithful few*, until the time arrives when the sad and awful tribulation of the Church *will open the blinded eyes of the Church.* 14. The primitive view alone enables us to accept and adopt *the exact language* of the Bible, such as e.g. "*The Coming of the Lord draweth nigh,*" "*Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man Cometh,*" "*The end of all things is at hand,*" and kindred passages. The Whitbyan theory can only receive these in consistency either by referring them to something else (as Providence, death, etc.), or by spiritualizing them into something indefinite. 15. The Whitbyan theory is one cause why prophecy is *so greatly neglected* by many. The prosperity and continued progress of the Church and the world toward Millennial blessedness is taken for granted, and it is not regarded essential *to investigate* the subject. Indeed in a multitude of instances *investigation is most unwelcome.*

Prophecies in antagonism to the prevailing view are called "*dark,*" "*hidden,*" "*mysterious,*" etc., and they are *avoided* on the alleged ground "*that they cannot be comprehended until after the fulfilment.*" In place of a personal consideration and comparison of Scripture relating to the subject, reliance is placed upon some theological work or commentary—however contradictory—and the labor of study thus prevented. Men, whose special business it is to proclaim the Word of God, are found in large numbers, who have never made the prophecies a careful and serious study. 16. No Millenarian, owing to the distinctive design of the Gospel now preached (viz., to save them that believe) has ever pronounced it "*a failure.*" It was no "failure" when preached by Jesus and the apostles and it has been none since, for it goes on steadily and unweariedly *in accomplishing the object intended.* 17. Hence all Millenarians, if true to their own avowed sentiments, must take a deep and lively interest in the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom. For, it is only by the preached Word, or by the acceptance of the truth in Christ Jesus, that "the elect" are gathered out, and it is *only when* these elect are all gathered that the Advent of Jesus and the resultant glory follows. That such is their feeling is evidenced by the acknowledgments—perhaps undesigned—of our opponents, who praise the missionary efforts and Christian labors of the first centuries. A recent notable example of the kind is found in "An Appeal to the Churches" favoring a General Revival of Religion, etc., issued from Boston 1867, and signed by sixty clergymen, headed by Albert Barnes. In this "*Appeal*" the first three centuries are lauded for the zeal, etc., manifested, and a decline in the fourth century noticed, and the significant sentence occurs: "It is also abundantly evident that the conversion of the world was advancing far more rapidly during the first three centuries, and was *prospectively much nearer its final completion* fifteen hundred years ago, than it is to-day." Discarding the notion that the Church then labored for *the conversion* of the world, which is contradicted by the writings of the Fathers, we accept of this impartial testimony to the faithfulness, activity, and piety of those *who were Millenarian* in doctrine, and labored earnestly to call the elect, and hasten the day of the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who, perhaps unguardedly, have so much to say about "*the injurious tendencies*" of our doctrine and "*the weakness of intellect*" allied with its reception (notwithstanding the large number of eminent and scholarly men who have entertained it) would do well *not only* to consider *the missionary spirit and success* of the early Church *but*

also the motives which urged them on in their labor of love and devotion —motives grounded in the doctrines advocated in this work.[7]

[1] Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 380), says that in the Protestant city of Berlin, out of a population of about 800,000 "it is said that less than 4000 attend public worship on the morning of the Lord's day." "In the Protestant city of London it is stated that 2,500,000 persons never enter a place where the Gospel is proclaimed." "In the Protestant city of Glasgow, according to a statement recently published by its leading ministers after making large allowance for the aged, the infirm, and the very young, it is shown that 125,000 souls never hear the Word of God." "The same astounding and humiliating results are seen in all our American cities. It St. Louis (his own city), for example, it is said that scarcely 15,000 persons, large and small, out of a population of more than 400,000 are found in all the Protestant places of worship put together, and in some of those numbered as evangelical, it is to be feared that the preaching does not contain the slightest flavor of the truth as it is in Jesus. The same enormous proportion of those who do not attend the worship of God is no doubt found in other places (comp. Prop. 174 for other statements), and the religious statistics of every leading city will show that those who really believe in Christ are not gaining ground, and they are not holding their own, because not increasing in the ratio of the world's lost and ruined population around them." In reference to the frightful disproportion of churches to the population of London, compare the statements of the Bish. of London and Lord John Russell as given in the art. on "The Growth of London" (*Cornhill Mag.*, reprinted in the *Libr. Mag.*, Feb., 1879). Comp. Props. 178, 177. Let us take a single American State as an illustration, one of the oldest and most highly favored by past religious instruction, and see the result. We will allow those who have no sympathy with our views to testify. Thus e.g. the *Princeton Review*, July, 1855, in the "Report of the General Assembly;" Mr. Storrs (delegate from the General Association of Massachusetts), "said he was surprised to learn, since his visit to the West, that the people of Massachusetts were regarded as a staid, sober, and settled community; whereas in fact there is no State in which thought is so unsettled, where Infidelity and Romanism are so active, if not so powerful," and the editor remarks: "This is a statement, the correctness of which we do not question." But since this declaration what a fearful increase of unbelief has been witnessed. The vast increase of Spiritualists according to Judge Edmonds, Owen, etc., and of Liberals, Socialists, Communists, etc., as witnessed all over the country and world, tells its own sad story. The statistics of the world are fearfully suggestive. The editor of Sir Th. Browne's *Religio Medici*, in a footnote attached to S. 25, gives the following: "The population of the world has been estimated at 1,000,000,000, viz., of Pagans, 630,000,000; of Mohammedans, 188,000,000; of Jews, 12,000,000; of Christians, 170,000,000." The *Eccles. Gazette* of Vienna, 1853 (quoted in Alzog's *Univ. Church His.*, vol. 3, p. 1023), has "total number of Catholics, 200,000,000; Oriental, Schismatical, and non-Catholic Christians, 75,000,000; Protestants of all classes, 80,000,000, or according to more recent reports 89,000,000." Sparry (The *Luth. Evangelist*, Ap., 1878), presents the statistics of the world's population and its relation to religion, and then says: "If only every third nominal Christian in the world be regarded as a true believer, the proportion of true believers to unbelievers is as 1 to 36 nearly; that is to say, for 25,000,000 of true believers or Christians, there are 875,000,000 of unbelievers." The *Ch. Union*, March 5th, 1879, gives from Peterman's *Mittheilungen*, these statistics: Pop. of the globe, 1,439,145,300; of which 7,931,080 are Jews, 186,860,076 are Roman Catholics, 82,926,049 are of the Greek Church, 103,453,594 are Mohammedans 131,091,941 are Protestants, 1,007,190 are Majians and Parsees, 483,015,475 are Buddhists, religions of the East and Pagans." Another estimate is added thus: Jews, 8,000,000; Christians of every name, 371,000,000; Mohammedans, 371,000,000; Hindoos, 139,500,000; Buddhists and religions of the East, 483,000,000; Pagans, 189,000,000." The *Ch. World*, Aug., 1876, gives Prof. Schem's estimate: Pop. of earth 1,396,841,000; of which 685,459,411 are under Christian government, and 711,382,589 are under non-Christian. The great cities ought to be, in view of the centralization of intelligence, etc. to be the centres of virtue, honor and religion, but what are they? We leave John Ruskin, who has no sympathy with our views, to describe them (comp. the Proposition 174) on signs, where a note from Ruskin is given; also London, in *Proph. Times*, March, 1867; New York as delineated in the N. Y. papers for the last twenty or more years, etc.). The increase of evil, appalling crimes, is self-evident by the most casual reading of the dailies, freighted as they are with the sad news of fornication, adultery, drunkenness, murder, etc., etc. Even a minister who takes in the *Times-Star* (1880, Nov.), a hopeful view of the condition of Cincinnati, because of the

increase of the membership in the churches (much of it nominal at that), admits that the places where liquor is sold under license have multiplied until they alone number 3500, while other powerful agencies advancing in power are ignored.

[2] Dr. Brown (*Ch. Sec. Com.*, p. 313) objects to Pre-Millenarianism because it has other agencies besides those now employed in the conversion of the world to Christ. To this we reply: (1) Many who receive the Post-Millenarian theory freely admit that the Mill. conversion will be largely affected by superadded agencies, even Supernatural, forced to such a conclusion by the predictions; (2) the things associated with this period of conversion are of such a nature that present means and agencies cannot possibly produce them; (3) we simply receive God's own declarations, believing that He alone is able to impart information concerning the agencies employed; (4) by comparing Scripture with Scripture we find that several things will bring about this result, such as the destruction of Antichrist, the judgments on Antichristian nations, the personal manifestation of Christ and the saints, the labor of Elijah, the personal pleading of Jesus, the phenomena witnessed, the great effusion and work of the Holy Spirit, the rule of the Christ and of the saints, and, according to Isa. 64, 65, 54; Zech. 14, etc., truth presented and thus enforced will, together with the worship assigned, have its saving, sanctifying influences; (5) when Brown narrows down the means leading to conversion "to the reception by sinners of a preached Gospel," he certainly limits it even in this dispensation, for the Gospel is now often received through afflictions, bereavements, providences. We do not reject but magnify "the Gospel," for we hold that the Gospel—partly exemplified in realized Redemption, partly enforced by providential movements and judgments, partly exhibited in the manifestation of the King and His rule, partly shown by the instrumentality of the saints and by the aid of the restored and happy Jewish nation—will attain *a power and majesty* which it never had previously; simply because instead of its then being "the Gospel of a Kingdom" still future, it is "the Gospel of a Kingdom" now established and manifested in power and glory, and hence as "a Gospel" the good news, exhibited and proven to be true, will bring, as prophets so graphically describe, the nations under its blessed influence, and into peaceful subjection to the Christ.

[3] Surely when religious bodies (as e.g. to-day the New York Presbytery, Feb., 1880, etc.) meet to discuss the causes of the Church's decline, and when eminent opponents of ours frankly but sadly admit that such a decline "was painfully manifest," and when the enemies of Christianity jubilantly present it in a multitude of articles and books, we may well assume our scriptural position, which explains all and gives the needed faith and courage. To indicate whether the parochial success of ministers should encourage the Whitbyan theory, we select, because acquainted with the brethren, the parochial reports of an Ohio Synod for 1879. The Pres. of the Synod preached a Whitbyan sermon from the text, "The field is the world," and in his report gives two congregations and *eight* additions while the losses are *seventeen*. Another Whitbyan divine reports for the entire year an addition of *three*, while the losses are *six*. Others are more successful, yet the entire Synod of twenty-five ministers report only a net increase of 119. We admit that success is no measure (and the most successful of ministers, as Tyng, etc., and evangelists, as Moody, etc., do not, although successful, forsake our views), but these brethren do, by appealing to the past and present, make it *a standard*, and it is well to remind them how it fails to meet the requirements they exact from it. Many like Dr. Fairchild (Pres. Oberlin Coll., on "The Needed Phases of Christianity") admit a wane of faith, and yet multitudes, discarding facts, confidently predict that in 50 years, more or less, the Gospel will be in every household (comp. e.g. art. by Clark in Littell's *Liv. Age*, 1872, "Wanted—a Religion for the Hindoos"), or as an example of arithmetical calculation, which ignores human depravity and the scriptural predictions relating to it, Dr. Schmucker's hopeful estimate in his *Popular Theology*. C. M. Nichols, of the *Spring-field Republic* (Nov. 25th, 1874), is not quite so sanguine, saying: "Christ told His disciples nearly 2000 years ago to preach the Gospel to every creature, and they have not done it yet. It is estimated that it will require 3000 more years to complete the work."

[4] We have referred to the Confessions in the history of the doctrine, and it may be sufficient to refer, in this connection, to the leading Protestant one, viz., the *Augsburg Confession*, giving the view of one of its expounders. John Conrad Goebel, in his sermons on the Confession (quoted by Dr. Seiss, footnote in *Apoc.*, No. 2, p. 213), interprets it as utterly repudiating the conversion of the world prior to the Sec. Advent, saying: '"The idea of a golden age in this world, before the resurrection of the dead, is a mere phantasm, not only contrary to the entire Holy Scripture, but especially contrary to the clear and lucid prophecies of the Lord Jesus Christ and His beloved Apostles, where they speak of the times immediately preceding the day of judgment—Matt. 24 : 23; 1 Tim.

4 : 1 ; 2 Tim. 3 : 1 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 3, and other places, where more may be seen upon the subject. Nothing is there said or predicted of a golden age, but only crosses and tribulations, which touch all the estates of the world. Concerning ecclesiastical affairs, it was predicted that in the last times many false Christs and false prophets shall arise, and shall do great signs and wonders, and deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. Concerning hearers, it was predicted that love would wax cold in the hearts of many, and faith wane to such a degree that Christ Himself asks : 'When the Son of Man Cometh shall He find faith on the earth?' Will that be a golden age? Concerning matters of state, it was predicted that unrighteousness shall sway them, and there shall be wars and rumors of wars, nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. Will that be a golden age? Concerning the family, it was predicted that the son shall be against the father, the daughter against her mother, and that a man s foes shall be those of his own house. Will that be a golden age? Concerning common life, it was predicted that there shall be distress of people on earth, and trembling, and fainting for fear, and for looking after the things that are to come upon the earth, and tribulation such as was not from the beginning and never shall be again. Will that be a golden age? And if we will only consider this matter a little in the fear of God, it will be seen that *this fanatical notion* contradicts all Scripture, as it is contrary to this article of our common Christianity." And to give his own views, he afterward adds : "Here on earth, while the world lasts, we are in the militant Church, and have to suffer as God wills, waiting patiently for the true golden age and the Kingdom of the adorable Trinity—not in this world here on earth, but in the future Kingdom of eternal glory and blessedness."—*Die XXI. art. Aug. Conf. in Prediger Erklärt*, pp. 1256–59. So also a recent writer in *Das Tausend-järige Reich gehört nicht der vergangenheit, soudern der Zukumft an;* Gütersloh, 1860, takes the same view of the Confession. Dr. Seiss truthfully says : "There is not a respectable Creed in all Christendom that embodies any such doctrine."

[5] So contagious is the false spirit of prediction, that even a college paper (*Wittenberger*, vol. 1, No. 1) is welcomed as "an auxiliary force to lift up the race, and to usher in the day of gold, the age of light and love, and so to reveal the Jasper City and the Emerald Gates." Woman suffrage, temperance, and other moral movements are thus elevated, with high-sounding phraseology, as exalted agencies in this work, and pious people, in the sincerity of their hearts, thinking to secure God's blessing, eulogize them in the most extravagant terms—overlooking the simple fact that if Jesus will ignore even professors who do not give up all sin and make an entire consecration of self to Him, much more will He refuse to acknowledge those who are willing to give up one sin and retain the rest, or who elevate human schemes into the place of the regenerating means of grace provided by God, or who put their trust in man instead of placing it in God. Whatever of good may be outside of the divinely ordained means, however it may be accepted and commended, it should never run in direct opposition to God's own declarations, and thus cause *false hopes* to arise. The only Saviour from sin and its sad consequences that the intelligent believer can recognize is Jesus—Jesus accepted and appropriated as the Scriptures so plainly teach. John Q. Adams, *Phi Beta Kappa Address*, said that "Opinion is the Queen of the World." Here is the danger ; if such opinion is solidly built on the declarations of God's Word it will be favorable in its influence, and just in proportion as it departs from it will its tendency be evil. But notwithstanding the extent of evil, many, influenced by a false application of prophecy, predict e.g. that infidelity, so widespread, will be of "short duration," and that "by permitting to a certain extent the prevalence of infidelity, Providence is preparing new triumphs for religion." How many Christians even, at the commencement of the French Revolution, misguided by the loud professions made in behalf of man, loudly proclaimed : "The devout mind will behold in these momentous changes the finger of God, and discern in them the dawn of that glorious period in which wars shall cease and Antichristian tyranny shall fail," etc. It would be superfluous to recall those predictions and eulogists, for the most of them lived long enough to see and acknowledge their mistake. The world is again full of such prophecies, and professed believers hasten to adopt and echo them, imparting to them a more scriptural garb.

[6] It is a responsible matter to predict that which is erroneous, Ezek. 22 : 28 ; it is a serious matter to refuse to impart the warnings that God has given, Ezek. 3 : 19–21 ; it is a duty to turn from those who pervert God's threatenings and predict "peace" and "no evil," Jer. 23 : 16, 17, and 14 : 13, 14, and 6 : 14. But unfortunately an incentive to such predicting is found in the fact that the multitude *desire it*, so that Jer. 5 : 31 is constantly fulfilling, and when prophesying prosperity, Mic. 2 : 11, they are so full and in need of nothing, that they, Mic. 3 : 5, oppose the true prophets. When truth is accessible and

it is deliberately rejected, an apology, Matt. 7 : 22, will scarcely avail with the Christ, even although done in His name. In reference to the future we are solely dependent upon what God Himself has declared concerning it, Isa. 44 : 24, 25, 26.

[1] The student will observe that our doctrine alone affords the most ample encouragement to the earnest layman, preacher, and missionary ; for, whatever success awaits our labor, we are engaged in the work contemplated, viz., *fulfilling the design of the dispensation* in gathering out a people for His name, and in presenting the Gospel as a witness. Hence whether men bear or forbear ; whether the results are small or large, we are acceptably performing our duty, and will meet with the divine approval. We cannot be indifferent to, or undervalue, any efforts made to spread the knowledge of God's Word, even if it be more or less connected with error or fanaticism, because if Christ is preached, if the Scriptures of truth are presented, if repentance and faith are urged, these things aid in accomplishing the number of the elect. We do not (as e.g. Harris in his *Great Commission*, p. 115, etc.) make success the criterion and incentive to duty ; love to Christ and His commands, love to our fellow-men, love for the election and its eternal results, love for the blessed hope and incoming inheritance, these are sufficient incentives. Harris (pp. 115–117) has grossly misrepresented our view and the tendency of our doctrine, when he declares that we proclaim no success, no valuable results but mere defeat, and that those who are supporters of Missions, etc., do it in violence to their creed, being "the result of principles which date anterior to their peculiar views of prophecy." Such statements evidence *a lack of knowledge* of our principles, doctrine, and history. As we asserted in previous paragraphs, no Millenarian holds to a lack of success or to a failure, simply because he sees the real design of the dispensation successfully carried out, whether few or many believe. A reference alone to the Primitive Church refutes and rebukes Harris's assertions, while the missionary activity and labors of many dates from the adoption of Pre-Mill. views, a belief in a speedy, Pre-Mill. Advent quickening zeal. Rev. Randolph, in an art. on "The Sec. Advent of Christ" (*Kentucky Tribune*, Feb. 13th, 1880), answers fully the stale objection "that Pre-Mill. views paralyze missionary effort," and quotes as follows : "Dr. Woods well says, 'I challenge Post-Millennialists to produce, on the one hand, *one single passage* of Scripture in which a Millennium is connected with a *subsequent Advent ;* and I challenge them, on the other hand, to bring forward *one single passage* in which the Advent is spoken of in connection with a *preceding* Millennium.' With equal triumph has Edward Garbett, one of England's first scholars —author of that celebrated book "Dogmatic Faith," and also of one of the ablest replies ever written, to John Stuart Mill—said in the recent Wimbledon Prophetic Conference, 'I challenge the friends of this old objection' (respecting missions) 'to produce from the Word of God *one single passage*, in either the Old or New Testament to show that the world is to be converted to Christ before Christ comes.' This challenge has never yet been accepted, and we may safely predict that it will not be." Chalmers (as quoted by Drs. Bonar, West, etc.) said : "Of this I am satisfied, that the next Coming of Christ will be a Coming not to final judgment, but a Coming to usher in the Millennium. I utterly despair of the universal prevalence of Christianity as the result of a missionary process. I look for its conclusive establishment through a widening passage of desolations and judgments, with the demolition of our civil and ecclesiastical structure" (comp. his "Sabbath Readings," vol. 1, p. 311). In other places we give the utterances, Pre-Millenarian, of able and well-known missionaries.

Obs. 10. This idea of the conversion of the world, or development theory, under existing instrumentalities and law, has been seized by semi-infidels and infidels, the advocates of "The Absolute Religion," and in their hands resolves itself into *a gradual education* of the world, the earliest ages being compared to infancy with its delusions, the middle to childhood with its follies, the later to manhood with its riper deductions, and the present, if we are to credit them, is bringing forth *the matured man* with his intellectual strength and wisdom. The *wisest men* of all generations *live now*, and will, it is assumed, *leaven the mass* until all possess full moral and religious truth through a generally diffused and constantly abiding inspiration equal to, yea, superior to, that of Paul or any of the prophets. To give an idea of the swelling words issuing from these "*inspired*" men, we give an extract from Frothingham's *Sermon* "On the

New Religion of Nature." "Nature's seers, running their eye along the line of the moral law, catch vistas in the future *brighter than those that now are fading from the Old Test. page;* and Nature's prophets, putting their ear to the ground, hear the murmur *of nobler revelations than were ever given to the old oracles now moving their stiffened lips in death.*" If this were the infatuated ravings of a few men, it might be passed by in silence, but unfortunately it forms the belief of a growing multitude, including men eminent in science and literature. The utterances of Parker, Carpenter, Draper, and a host of others are *so well adapted to human nature,* calling for no Christian repentance and self-denial, and *so pleasing and acceptable to the natural inclinations and desires,* demanding no Christian's cross to be borne, that human depravity eagerly seizes upon their prophecies, and exalts them as *the hope* of humanity. Such is the progress made in this direction that the predictions given by Guizot (*His. of Civ.*), Hutton (*Essays*), Eaton (*Perman. of Chris.*), and others are superseded by later and more extravagant ones, which, owing to their disrespectful allusions to Christ, etc. (which even *a decent literary regard* for the relation that Christianity has sustained in the past to literature and men of learning, if not respect for the opinions and feelings of a large class, ought to have prevented), we omit repeating. We select one or two of the more respectable class to illustrate the predictions given. A liberal writer, Johnson (*Oriental Religions*), presents us with "the delusive" hopes entertained by positive religions through an "instinct of universality," which contain a germ of truth, viz., that the emancipation of the race will be brought about by *the natural development of human nature,* and then predicts that in this developing process all existing religions must fall before *the Free, Liberal, Universal Religion of human nature.* He speaks of "*the Religion of religions, whose Bible shall be the full Word of Human Nature,*" produced mainly through physical and mental science, having its basis in the axiom, "*the stability of law is the guarantee of universal good.*" He says: "In their natural impatience to count these unknown millions as converts to Christian theology, the churches but feebly comprehend *the seriousness* of the situation" (which we can well believe, seeing the number of "Free Religious Associations" organized in many countries and even extending to India, as mentioned by him). "Christianity, as well as heathendom, is on *the eve of judgment.*" "I firmly believe that in making the worship of Jesus as 'the Christ' *a prescriptive basis of faith,* it will strike against a mass of outside human experience so overwhelming as to put beyond a doubt the futility of pressing *either this or any other exclusive claim as authoritative for mankind.*" "The change from distinctive Christianity to Universal Religion is *a Revolution* compared with which the passage from Judaism to Christianity itself *was trivial.*" This he holds forth as "*a promise of Science and a consequence of Liberty.*" Alas! turning to the Bible, it will be found that these predictions concerning the future agree with those that the prophets themselves give, viz., that men, forsaking the truth, shall lay such stress on the *stability* of nature, that *scoffingly* they shall ask, "*Where is the promise of His Coming?*"—that there shall be such *a self-glorification* of man, such *a deification* of the same, that it shall result in *the fearful confederation of the nations against "the Christ.*" This revamping of the old Pantheistic theory, and urged from a humanitarian standpoint, is performing *its predicted work,* preparing the way for the downtreading of the Church and the fatal overthrow

of the fondly cherished Whitbyan theories. Works designed for popular reading, and sent broadcast into the world, eulogize this coming religion which all shall embrace, as e.g. Figuier (*The To-morrow of Death*, p. 341, etc.) tells us that it is a religion as yet in its embryotic state, "until the growth of reason in the popular mind has helped to create the religion of science and nature;" and "this new religion will be the work of the twentieth century." The development theory, so unguardedly seized by Christian apologists to gloss over the supposed errors of the Apostolic Church, becomes in the hands of the infidel *a formidable weapon* against Christianity itself, making the latter only a stepping-stone in the advancement of the race under the present ordering of the world. Our doctrine, on the other hand, makes *no concessions* and affords *no arguments* of which unbelief can avail itself and turn against the truth.

Some persons have unbounded confidence in education, literary elevation, science, art, etc., as the means by which the world is to be reformed. Let any one impartially read the history of literature as given by Sismondi and others, and he will find the sad confession made that periods resplendent in literary excellence were followed by a corruption of sentiment and morals (as e.g. in Arabia, Greece, Spain, Italy, etc.). However valuable literary effort in the various fields may be, a reliance upon it *to reform the depravity* of man, is vain. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that some of the most abandoned and corrupt of men have given us some of the finest, most chaste and elevated works in poetry, science, art, etc., making it self-evident that the mere intellectual had but *little corrective* power upon themselves. Intelligence perverted becomes a most dangerous power. D'Aubigne, in his first ch. of the *His. of the Reformation* (p. 84), when enumerating the causes why Italy, so refined and enlightened, could not receive the reform, says: "But the very nature of their mental culture was a still greater obstacle than the presumption of their hearts. Could men, who admired the elegance of a well-cadenced sonnet more than the majestic simplicity of the Scriptures, be a propitious soil for the seed of God's Word? A false civilization is, of all conditions of a nation, that which is *most repugnant* to the Gospel." So it is to-day; multitudes take far greater pleasure in poetry, art, the drama, literature, etc., than in the sublime truths of the Word; multitudes elevate science above the Bible as being alone authoritative and worthy of credence; and multitudes turn away from God's Word to find their highest pleasure in the fictional of the day. And in reference to the latter, Hurst (*His. of Rationalism*, p. 391) finds "consolation" in the fact that the works of Sue, George Sand, Dumas, father and son, are so extensively read; and while insisting that their tendency is "pernicious," he adds: "If we may think they will serve as a medium of passage for the French masses to the reading and adoption of the truths of the Gospel, let us not be too slow to accept *the consolation*." The idea of making such things *preparatory stages* to the Gospel is certainly original, and must be flattering to that class of writers, who never dreamed of making such an application, scorning the Gospel and its proffered salvation.

In Spencer's *Philos. of Evolution*, Huxley's *Lay Sermons and Addresses*, Michelet's *Bible of Humanity*, Wright's *Principia*, Lecky's *His. of Rationalism*, and in hundreds of similar works (as well as in Reviews of eminence like the *Contemporary*, etc., in papers like Owen's *Millennial Gazette*, in thousands of articles like that on "Immortality" in Littell's *Liv. Age*, 1872), we have prophecies of a glorious future worked out by man himself (although some sadly confess doubts whether it can remove *the curse* which now burdens humanity, and others acknowledge that sorrow and trial, sickness and death, the dreadful outbursts of nature, etc., are beyond its reach). The introduction of a philosophical Utopia through the agency of boasted material and intellectual agencies (which have no tendency to control the heart or remove the curse), as e.g. represented in *Realized Ideals* (Greg's *Enigmas of Life*), is a favorite with many. The philosophical schools have elaborated various theories respecting the future amelioration of the race; some having confidence in the gradual progress of humanity toward such a goal by the aid of a natural religion, science, and philosophy; others discard religion as unnecessary to such a development, science and reason, with all that pertains to humanity and nature, being amply sufficient.* The former assert that when the predicted end is attained, then God will be

* Prof. Cocker, Clarke, Neander, Pressense, and others, insist that Greek philosophy prepared the way for Christianity, and that it was "a schoolmaster to bring men to

acknowledged as Supreme, being manifested in and through man, a progress to a Theistic or Pantheistic position ; the latter are equally positive that the only religion then extant will be a religion or worship of humanity and nature, being a Rationalistic, Humanitarian, or Naturalistic conclusion. All, however, are forced to admit that emancipation thus promised is immeasurably below the high standard promised in the Holy Scriptures, since it cannot as God's Word, hold out *a perfect deliverance* to the individual (as e.g. victory over death), to nature (as e.g. from its convulsions), or to the race (as e.g. its restoration to an Edenic condition). We have from various sources numerous labored efforts to prove that every religion that has ever existed is only a step, or sort of preparatory staging, in the progress of humanity, and to establish this point all history is rudely violated, which testifies that every nation as it advanced in age and strength also advanced in luxury and vice, immorality and infidelity, notwithstanding its religion and the impression made by it upon the few. By only giving the good and the moral that may exist in the more prominent religions special prominence, and leaving out of the count the bad and immoral *also existing* (and which the good could not overbalance and restrain), such a one-sided theory can be made out. It is only by men closing their eyes *to stubborn facts* that they console themselves with such specious reasoning, dreaming that it gives hope for the future. However plausible in some of its arguments and artful in some of its representations, stripped of its pretensions, it resolves itself in an effort to exalt Pantheism, Rationalism, Humanity, or Nature, affording no well-grounded hope, based on the real facts of the past, for the development advocated. While we would, on the one side, avoid the wholesale condemnation of ethnic religions, admitting that they were, to some extent, the outgrowths of a sense of accountability and a recognition of dependence and conscience, yet, on the other hand, we equally avoid making these the necessary stepping-stones or handmaidens to Christianity ; or of placing them on an equality with the Christian religion ; or even (as some do in their boasted veneration of human nature) giving them a superiority over the divine utterances ; or of making them in connection with Christianity natural outgrowths which are to develop into a new and perfected state by continued progress. So e.g. Johnson (*Freedom of Religion*) says : " Buddha, Pythagoras, Jesus, Luther, and the rest, are children of their times ; out of Greece and Judea came Christianity ; out of Christianity, and Brahminism, and Parseeism, and Judaism, and Islam, and all the grand currents of this century's civilization, flows the vaster tidal wave of Universal Religion." Saml. Longfellow (*Freedom and Fellowship*, Essay 2), in the lofty delineation of his "Church of the Future," makes it to be " the Broad Church" (reminding one of Jesus's teaching of "the broad way"), or " the Birth-right Church of Man." Christianity is reduced to the level of heathen religions, and in defence it is said : "*Religious* is a higher and broader word than *Christian*, and so is *Human*. Jewish, Brahmin, Buddhist, Parsee, Mohammedan, these, too, *are churches of the One Living God, the Father of All.*" And this new " Broad Church is the Eternal Gospel ; this the true Church Catholic ; the Church not of Rome, nor of England ; the Church not of Buddha, nor of Moses, nor of Christ, *but of God and Man.*" And these "*great swelling words of vanity*" (2 Pet. 2 : 18) contain the unbeliever's hope of Redemption ! the regeneration of the world ! Some, too, pre-

---

Christ," and as proof point to the churches established in Greece, etc. While there is some truth attached to their views, yet too much stress is laid upon it, being made too great a factor in the introduction of Christianity. For, instead of bringing men to Jesus, its tendency, *as facts of history incontestibly prove*, was to repel men from Him, seeing that the churches of Greece (as Paul testifies) had but few of those who entertained the views of the philosophers ; that the most violent, bitter, and unrelenting opponents and persecutors were adherents of this philosophy ; and that the effects of this same philosophy, so far as incorporated in teaching and doctrine, was to bring untold evils upon the Church. This class of writers generally, imbued by a philosophical spirit, zealously, in advocating the conversion of the world, advocate the division of the history of the Church, into three or more periods (as e.g. the Petrine, Pauline, and Johannean), more or less fanciful. They do not even pause to learn that their favorite theory of such successive and distinctive periods is found in the vaticinations of the monk Joachim, set forth with all the pretensions of a special illumination received to elucidate the future. Philosophy, as history corroborates, too often strikes hands with fanaticism. We need not be surprised that James Freeman Clarke (*Ten Great Religions*) says in confirmation of his theory that all religions are a kind of forerunners : " Islam is a John the Baptist crying in the wilderness, ' Prepare the way of the Lord ;' Mohammed is a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ."

tend that Christianity itself (*which they never received, and never experienced*) forces them to take this position, as e.g. the author of *the Ancient His. of the East*, in the Preface remarks : "Thus, above all, it is that I am almost invincibly attached to the doctrine of the constant and unlimited progress of humanity—a doctrine unknown to Paganism, a doctrine born of Christianity, and whose whole law is found in the words of the Evangelist, 'Be ye perfect.'" Unbelief seizes the words addressed to believers, urging them to completeness of character, and applies them to this universal progress, a process of reasoning in which they are materially aided by an allegorizing, spiritualizing, and philosophical Christianity, but which is *plainly and emphatically condemned* by the Scriptures, as we have shown. Men of a religious and devout mind, like Schlegel (*Philos. of His.*, Lect. 18, etc.) express their faith and hope in a rapidly approaching era—nearer than many suppose—when by the aid of philosophy linked with Christianity there will be "a thorough religious regeneration of the State and science," by which "the cause of God and Christianity may obtain a complete triumph on the earth"—thus directly opposing the biblical statement, that States and nations, instead of being regenerated, shall oppose the truth and at the close of the age be found in direct conflict with the cause of God. Schlegel's hope is not in the Advent of Jesus (where the Bible places it), but "the religious hope of a true and complete regeneration of the age by a Christian system of government and a Christian system of science" (the latter expression being elsewhere explained "by the establishment of a Christian philosophy or Catholic science"). The author of *The Hand of Man and the Finger of God in the Misfortunes of France*, predicts a glorious future—in which France is prominently to participate—and triumph of "the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman and Holy Church." Protestants reiterate like predictions pertaining to Protestantism. A hundred sects bring them forth as a motive power to exertion. Even Mormonism (*The Pop. Science Monthly*, Dec., 1876) anticipates in the near future, with a serene confidence, "the conversion of all who inhabit their vast continent." These predictions, by changing the phraseology, are boldly appropriated by unbelief, either by modifying Christianity by additions ; or by making it simply preparative for another religion ; or by pronouncing it a failure and its assumed successor to be the destined triumphant one. Works like *The Oriental Religions* are multiplying, and the leaven is already widely working in literary journals, newspapers, text books of colleges and high schools, etc.

The observer of prevailing literature must have noticed the change in the more recent attacks of unbelief. Many disliking the reasoning of Bh. Butler, Leland, Foster, Lardner, Paley, Whately, and others in favor of Christianity, are shifting the struggle from the Supernatural, infallibility, inspiration, etc., to another field of inquiry, viz., making the ultimate success of Christianity the measure of its truth. This is an insidious and dangerous attack, and has been provoked by Christians themselves ; for misapprehending the nature and design of the present dispensation, they have paraded in philosophical, historical, religious, and other works the progressive nature and final triumph of Christianity as now constituted, in and through the Church. Indeed, sometimes the only reply to infidelity has been the production of this *unscriptural* reason. This now has become an important question, as is evidenced by the fact that recently a large number of works have appeared taking sides ; the one party contending—from facts of history, the advancement of man in intelligence, the present position of the Church, the growing unbelief, etc.—that the Christian Church will not triumph, and hence conclude that it is not adapted to the nature and progress of man and the race ; the other party affirm—from past periods of success, supposed divine assurances, prophecies torn from their connection, etc.—that its ultimate triumph is undoubted, and hence declare in glowing language that it is in all respects adapted to the conversion of the world. To indicate how this point is regarded, we quote the words of a mild Pantheistic-Naturalistic writer, favorably disposed to receive Christianity, if the cross of Jesus is removed and "the strait gate" is cut some wider. He says, after a sarcastic allusion to the school of Lardner, Paley, and Whately : "But the real question between Christians and unbelievers in Christianity is, not whether our religion is or is not Supernatural ; not whether Christ's miracles were, or were not violations of law ; nor whether the New Testament as it stands is the work of inspired men. The main question, back of all these, is different and not dependent on the views we may happen to take of the universality of law. It is this : Is Christianity, as taught by Jesus, intended by God to be the religion of the human race? Is it only one among the natural religions ; is it to be superseded in its turn by others ; or is it the one religion which is to unite all mankind? 'Art Thou he that should come, or look we for another?' This is the question which we ask Jesus of Nazareth, and the answer to which makes the real problem of apologetic theology." He

states that this answer, if favorable, will "show it to be true," because it evinces its adaptedness to human nature, which infers design, and leads to God the designer of it. This is a most deceptive and dangerous mode of reasoning, and must, sooner or later, lead to a bald infidelity. Let the reader observe that it is *very significant* that previous to the coming of the culminated Antichrist with his triumph over the Church (as surely predicted), the triumph of that Church should be made so prominent a criterion. It is a snare artfully contrived to entangle the masses when depression, disaster, and terrible persecution again comes. It, too, is based on the false assumption that Christianity, if divine, must rescue and reunite the race, when *the design of this dispensation* is the reverse. Those who indorse this presumption, instead of adopting God's *declared Divine Purpose* in reference to this dispensation, virtually undertake to decide for themselves what is, and what is not, worthy of divine procedure, thus giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the truth. This, too, is done under an honest and sincere misapplication of the facts of history and the predictions of God's Word. Thus e.g. Rev. Dr. Helwig, in a temperance lecture reported in the *Springfield Republic*, Dec. 24th, 1877, indorses the statement of multitudes, that the triumph of truth is always certain, saying that "although the wrong may at times seem triumphant, it is but for a day. Right has might and power for its allies, *and will triumph*, for it is the truth." All history, as well as the Bible, contradicts this as illustrated in the antediluvian world, the overthrow of the Theocracy, the closing of the Mosaic economy, the continued unbelief and punishment of the Jewish nation, the dark ages, the gigantic proportions of error even in organized forms, the future coming conflict with the culminated Antichrist, the predicted ending of this age, etc. No! the Word assures us, that while God will see to it that truth, the light, shall always, more or less, exist *as a testimony and to accomplish the Divine Purpose intended by this dispensation*, its triumph will *only* be secured by the personal Coming of Him, who is the Truth. All this looseness of expression, confirms the hopes of the worshippers of humanity, as e.g. expressed in the funeral oration of Wm. Haller delivered by Mr. Clark (*Cin. Enquirer*, March 4th, 1881) who, after eulogizing humanity, after giving no hope to the individual of a future but an "endless rest" in the green and flowery earth, after praising the labors of humanitarians and of the deceased, concludes: "Thus such lives as thine, beating themselves out in strife with hoary wrongs, shall not be lived in vain. Those wrongs, though they seem 'rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun,' shall crumble and fall, and Astrea shall hang her scales in the sky, and a Golden Age dawn upon the earth, brighter even than thy hope." We may well conclude with the words of Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com. Luke*, p. 269): "There is a heaven-wide distinction between the eschatological expectations which the friends of modern liberalism cherish, and those which are called forth by this teaching of our Lord. It is commonly supposed that in the proportion in which the principles of humanitarianism, culture, free thought, and the like, are more widely diffused, the world will become ever increasingly wiser, better, and happier. The Saviour here opens to us a very different view of the times immediately before the end. Of culture and the false semblance of external secular enlightenment, there will then undoubtedly be as little lack as in the days of Noah and Lot. But instead now of the great mass becoming continually better and more earnest, we have to expect, on the other hand, according to the Saviour's words, a time of carelessness, hardening, and carnal security, just like that which preceded the destruction of the ancient world and the ruin of Sodom. These are the perilous times in the last days, of which Paul also speaks, 2 Tim. 3 : 1; and all which in the Apoc. is prophesied of the great apostasy of the last period of the world, is only a wider expansion of the theme here (Luke 17 : 20–37) given."

PROPOSITION 176. *Our doctrine of the Kingdom embraces the conversion of the world, but in the Scriptural order.*

While rejecting the Whitbyan theory of a future conversion of the world *previous* to the Second Advent of Jesus as unscriptural and misleading, we at the same time firmly hold to a future blessed and glorious conversion of the Jews and Gentiles *after* the Sec. Advent, as plainly taught in the Word.

Hence we reject as utterly unreliable that large class of works which predict "smooth things" respecting the Church. Take as an illustration Bunsen's *Church of the Future*, and it will be found irreconcilable with a large class of predictions, which it quietly ignores. However valuable some of its suggestions, they are neutralized by the false motive for effort presented; however desirable the result advocated, it is vitiated because directly contrary to the one the Scriptures portray. The "Church of the Future" instead of converting the nations, is to be itself under fearful trial, persecution, and suffering. It is useless—yea, dangerous—to portray a Church as our hope widely different from that which the Spirit of God has delineated. A critic of Bunsen, placing his hope in this direction, remarks: "All hail, to such a Church of the Future! The world yearns for it; creation groans for it. Society is sick at heart; sick of sore maladies which politics can scarcely cure; sick of many empirics and few physicians. And Christ's Church alone has the panacea—the universal cure." Alas! thus the Church is deliberately substituted in *Christ's place*, and the Church is made to do the work which the Spirit attributes *alone to Christ* at His Second Coming. Thousands of works take this false position, leading the Church into a state of unbelief, from which some day there will be a terrible awakening.

Obs. 1. Such Scriptures as Ps. 72 : 8–11; Zech. 9 : 10; Isa. 60 : 11–22; Dan. 7 : 14, 27; Hab. 2 : 14; Isa. 11 : 9, etc., are *undoubtedly to be fulfilled*, being the legitimate outgrowth of covenant promises, and pertaining to the promised Kingdom, honor, and glory of the Redeemer. The certainty of realization is apparent not only because given by the Omniscient Spirit conversant with "the deep things" of God, but by its being bound up with the fulfilment of the Divine Purpose. Hence it is that the prophecies bearing on this point are among the unconditional (comp. Prop. 18), for such a state of things is connected with the sway, extent, splendor, and glory of *the Theocracy* itself. The completeness of redemption, the perfection of restitution, the greatness of an Almighty Redeemer, cannot and will not be satisfied with anything less. The Theocratic ordering aims to bring all into subjection, and when established in its might will proceed in this glorious undertaking. This conversion is so interwoven with the descriptions of the Theocratic Kingdom, its extent and greatness, and with the Theocratic King, His sway over the nations and majesty, that it cannot possibly be ignored, or be removed, without a serious flaw. Therefore it is that God has affirmed it to be as sure of realization as that He Himself existed (Numb. 14 : 21). "*But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord*," which glory, as numerous parallel passages (e.g. Isa. 60) show, is identified with the restoration of the race as such, to its former Edenic holiness and happiness.

Dr. Finney, *Dis. on the Sec. Advent*, makes the world's conversion one of necessity, being based on the attributes of God. The argument is certainly a very bold one when applied *to the present dispensation*, for it proves entirely too much, making the infinite benevolence of God the sole standard by which to judge of the number of the saved—the very reasoning that the Universalists employ for the same purpose. It is, therefore, placing ourselves in the place of judges respecting the expediency of the divine purposes, and the manner in which they should be carried out, which is always a dangerous procedure. We dare not confine God's purposes to one dispensation unless it is specifically stated; we must follow the purpose as it is unfolded and declared, observing *how and when* it is to be realized. If Dr. Finney's argument had been used by a Jew before the first Advent—and it would have been *à priori* just as reasonable—it would not have been verified in that dispensation as history demonstrates, and so now, if we allow the Scriptures to testify, it will still remain unrealized in the present dispensation. His reasoning, therefore, is only pertinent to its certainty and accord with God's own ultimate glory. This we accept, while the limitation to the present dispensation we reject, because the exact reverse, as we have shown under the preceding Propositions, is the plain and decisive teaching of Scripture. Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 795), speaking of "the consummation of all things" as presented by Scripture, remarks: "The prospect here opened up is well adapted to put to shame every optimistic-humanistic dream, as though in this best of worlds things should grow better, the nearer the stream of time rolls to the ocean of eternity." Extremes meet, seeing that Is. Taylor (*His. of Enthusiasm*, p. 183) thinks that the speedy conversion of the world would probably cause evils to arise, etc., instead of founding its non-arrival, as the Scriptures, on human depravity.

Obs. 2. This Prop. is the more necessary, since—notwithstanding the Primitive Church teaching, and the reiterated statements of numerous Pre-Millenarian writers—works are circulated, like *The Kingdom of Grace*, which boldly misrepresent our doctrine, making us to teach, like themselves (i.e. Anti-Millenarians), or like the Millerites, some Second Adventists, and Seventh-Day Adventists, that after the Second Advent there is no more probation, no salvation for the race, and no "increase of the Kingdom of the Messiah." These are their own deductions and not ours, being discarded by almost every Pre-Millenarian from the early Church down to the present. The objection is only plausible by classing men with us, who, aside from expecting the speedy Advent, have no special doctrinal affiliation with us, but entertain the popular views respecting the judgment, conflagration, and consequences of the Advent in its relation to the race. Such misconceptions of our belief might be passed by without notice, if they were not repeated in respectable reviews, journals, etc., as e.g. in *The Presbyterian Quarterly Review* for 1853. Those not conversant with our doctrine, finding the most positive declarations respecting such a conversion, and God's own existence pledged for its ultimate verification, at once conclude that we are in gross error, and thus become prejudiced against us.

Dr. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 313), following others, charges Pre-Millenarians with "sneering" at Bible and missionary societies, and with indulging in "ill-disguised insinuations—sometimes not disguised at all—against the *Word* and the blessed *Spirit* themselves, as inadequate to accomplish the predicted evangelization of the world." This is a *perverted, false* statement, eminently calculated to prejudice others against us. No Pre-Millenarian speaks slightingly or disrespectfully of the Word or the Spirit, or refuses to acknowledge the eminent services of Bible and missionary societies (unless it be some unsound, erratic, or fanatical person belonging to some small sect, whom Dr. B. is afraid to quote, seeing that the quotation itself would prove our defence), for we all ascribe the failure of such non-conversion, not to the Spirit or Word, not to the lack of abundant provision or merciful invitation, but to the depravity of man which rejects the provision made. It is our reverence for the truth which causes us to insist that a true honoring of the Word and Spirit demands that we receive the Scriptural teaching respecting the design of this dispensation (Props. 86, 87), and not ignore the Sec. Advent and the events produced by it. Even those persons who deny any future conversion Pre- or

Post-Advent, do not—as simple justice demands—base the same on the inadequacy of the Word or Spirit. We, however, accept of a future conversion, but locate it later, and indorse the instrumentalities specifically mentioned by the Spirit in the Word as necessary to its fulfilment. The attacks in this direction are painfully one-sided, and often so sweeping that the exhibited prejudice and ignorance gives the requisite answer. Thus as illustrative: The *Princeton Review*, April, 1851, contains an art., "Foreign Missions and Millenarianism," which speaks of "the extremely injurious tendency of the Millenarian theory;" of its "restraining the zeal and activity of God's people;" of its "forbidding the exercise of faith," "sweeping away our interest in prayer and our agonizing dependence on the Holy Spirit;" and of its "baneful influence on the cause of missions." Our refusal to indorse his theory of the conversion of the world and to pray for that which the Word, in our estimation, clearly condemns, causes the writer to impute all these evils to us, forgetting *the large number of missionaries* who have been and are Millenarian, who have manifested a faith, prayer, dependence on the Spirit, etc., which he will find hard to imitate. When, therefore, he eulogizes the missionaries as "the most successful preachers who have lived for the last fifteen hundred years," he, without knowing it, includes, of course, the large body of Pre-Millenarians, who have been so successful in founding and sustaining missions, and who showed that faith in taking out a people for His name, faith in hastening the number of the elect and the subsequent glory, faith in witnessing for the truth whether successful or not, in performing the allotted work and last command of the Master, etc., was amply sufficient to cause them to make the heaviest sacrifices and to accept of the severest self-denial "to save them that believe." (The reader will comp. Props. 78 and 183.)

Obs. 3. The Eschatology, in systems of belief, which rejects this future conversion of the Jews and Gentiles—as e.g. in Millerism, Second Adventism, Seventh-Day Adventism, Anti-Millennial, etc.—is most certainly defective. It is alike derogatory to the Word which plainly predicts it, to the completeness of salvation which requires it, and to the honor and glory of the Redeemer which, in view of the promises associated with the same, demands it. Fettered by their Kingdom theory, or by a class of passages dislocated from their dispensational connection, they see no place *for such a Millennium* as the Scriptures present, in which the nations are brought into subjection to the Messiah's reign and saints' rule. Some even take the Millennial predictions, interwoven with the perpetuation and subjection of the race, which describe an era of blessedness here on the earth, and without the least authority transfer the whole to the third heaven. This is a most arbitrary way in disposing of Scripture, and indicates clearly that the central doctrine of the Kingdom is entirely misapprehended.

Under various Propositions these views are presented in detail, and require no special refutation. The argument alleged (as e.g. by Waggoner, *Ref. of Age to Come*) against the conversion of the world after the Advent derived from the nature and expressions of Revelation designed for the present dispensation (such as "the narrow way," "come out of tribulation," "some shall only believe," etc.) is exceedingly weak and imperfect (inferential, and wrong in the same) against the impregnable covenants, postponement of the Kingdom, the perpetuation of the race, the age to come, etc. Such writers mistake the Kingdom, the relation of the Jewish nation to it, and various other considerations, which we present in their logical connection, exhibiting the scriptural basis supporting the same. Such Props. as relate to the events associated with and following the Sec. Advent, and show that the covenants, both Abrahamic and Davidic, are unmistakably fulfilled in their plain grammatical sense, that ages follow this one, that the race is perpetuated, that Revelation will be continued, that all the forfeited blessings and not merely a part are restored, etc.—cannot be set aside by mere inference and an ignoring of Scripture; for over against the denial of such a future conversion we have God's promises fortified by oath. This doctrine is not man's, but is given by God, having reference to His own glory, and must be received by accepting of, and comparing, all Scripture on the subject.

Obs. 4. We make the conversion of the world, when it does occur, *a sublimer, more enduring and exalted transaction* than that proposed by other

theories. Instead of making it a mere Constantinean era or a Gospel dispensation, or one in which Antichrist and wicked confederations exist, or one of a mixed condition subject to the curse, etc., we, under the direct auspices of Christ and His co-rulers, and with the wonder-working aid of the Holy Spirit, have the age ushered in, and continued on, realizing in all its fulness the ample and complete fulfilment of the Millennial prophecies, *just as they read*, embracing a world-wide dominion and the richest blessings. While this, at the close of the thousand years, gives place to a brief rebellion, yet this dominion, this subjection of the nations, this supreme acknowledgment of the King, is ever afterward secured.

The history of man in epochal or dispensational endings, as the Edenic, Antediluvian, Patriarchal, Mosaic, Personal Messianic, of the past, and of the present Christian as delineated e.g. in Revelation, conclusively shows that just such a dispensation, embracing the Personal rule of Jesus and the saints, as we advocate, is needed to bring about this submission and allegiance of the nations. This is confirmed by the plain scriptural statements and the conclusion can only be avoided by displacing or denying the Advent itself, or by dislocating passages which are united, or by applying to one dispensation things which belong to another, or by bestowing upon the Gentiles that which exclusively belongs to the Jews. We freely admit that to obtain a proper, consistent knowledge of the subject, a study of the Scriptures is required. The importance of it, and its bearing (as we have repeatedly shown) on related subjects, especially demands such a study from the ministry, who are supposed to be leaders in teaching Scripture doctrine. A professed ignorance is culpable ; a false modesty under the assumption of a clear logical announcement by the Spirit being a felt want, is a reflection upon the divine teaching. Such utterances as the following, eagerly seized and paraded by our opponents, are to be regretted : The *Ch. Union* (Sep. 19th, 1877) compliments the "good sense from Mr. Spurgeon on the Sec. Advent," by quoting him as saying : " The more I read the Scriptures as to the future, the less I am able to dogmatize. I see conversion of the world, and the Personal Pre-Millennial reign, and the sudden Coming, and the judgment, and several other grand points, but I cannot put them in order, nor has any one else done so yet." We have only to say that if this is Spurgeon's utterance, (1) it is not flattering to his many utterances where he presents an order ; (2) it is contradictory, as e.g. in asserting a Personal Pre-Millennial reign which involves, of necessity, an order ; (3) it indicates a lack of special attention to the covenants ; (4) it implies that on great leading subjects which ministers are expressly to teach, they are purposely left in ignorance ; (5) it ignores the labors of others, as e.g. that of the early Church (which had an order in Eschatology), and will not allow to them that which he himself has not done ; (6) it is misleading, since (aside from minor details) the Scriptures do give a complete and harmonious order of the things referred to by him ; (7) it deters others from the subject under the false idea that if he, so great and popular a minister, has failed to make out an order, others cannot do it, when the truth is, as his works abundantly evidence, that, able and useful as he has been, Pre-Millennial in tendency as various utterances show, he has a defective and contradictory Eschatology, the radical defect of which is that it is not rooted and grounded *in the Abrahamic and Davidic Covenants*, but sustains itself by a commingling of literal and spiritualistic interpretations.

Obs. 5. The position that we thus occupy is a sufficient answer to those who declare that we dishonor the Spirit by not admitting that the work of universal conversion will be performed *in this dispensation*. For we *honor* the Spirit in first receiving what *He has said* on the subject, and, secondly, in showing that His work will be accomplished *more fully and perfectly* in the age to come than, as our opponents are willing to admit, it will be in this age. He is now doing His work in the process of gathering a people for God, and this, we contend, is only *the earnest* of a greater still to come. (*Comp. Prop.* 171.) May we say to our opposers that, peradventure, in their efforts to glorify the Spirit, they may, unconsciously, dishonor the Lord Jesus, for as one (Dr. Cummings) has well said : " The Spirit is not

a substitute for Jesus." The Spirit points us to the Christ and teaches us what to await for at His Coming, and *in implicit trust* our hearts accept of the same.

In view of our doctrines respecting the conversion of the world, the Kingdom of Christ, etc., we are unjustly accused as "traitors to the Church," or, at least, of taking "little interest in her welfare." While this is effectually disproved by the zeal, laborious lives, missionary spirit, martyrdom, sacrifices of thousands of Chiliasts in the past, and by the fact that our belief, if properly apprehended in their logical connection, immeasurably exalts the Kingdom of Jesus and increases the number of the ultimate converted (saving not merely the fragments of a race, but finally the race itself), yet it may be said that such a charge is by no means new or strange. When men, accepting of God's Word, deal *in unwelcome truths*, they are thus characterized. Dealing in prophecy, Isaiah and other teachers were branded as traitors to God's people. When e.g. Jeremiah (ch. 27) insisted, in accordance with the predictions of God, that the Jews should, in order to obtain quiet, submit to the King of Babylon, he was regarded as unfaithful and a visionary. The gravest suspicions were entertained concerning him, which finally resulted even in his imprisonment. Still relying on the prophetic Word, he unfalteringly declared his faith in the Spirit's predictions, and that safety and peace depended on the reception of these truths, however unpalatable or unseemly they were to the masses. The result proved, in the safety of believers and in the destruction of the unbelievers, that the estimate formed respecting the prophet and God's predictions were not only unworthy of faith in God, but dangerous to those who were faithless. Thus it ever has been. Had the Church heeded the warnings given by prophecy, many and great evils would have been averted. Blinded, however, by a worldly policy, guided by human wisdom, she has been flooded with error and crippled by submission to human inventions and power. Even to-day, when men arise and point us to the prophetic Word with warnings of danger, persecution, judgment, and bloodshed still in the future, and peradventure not very distant, multitudes arise in antagonism, and brand them as Jeremiah was branded, and would, if they dared, proceed to severer measures. "Heretics" and "fanatics" are but mild terms in comparison with some that have caught the writer's eye. Threats of Church trial and excommunication are freely made. Men, too, of acknowledged ability and learning, cater to this opposition by deliberately showing from reason, false philosophy, and wrested Scripture that such danger does not exist. The plain unvarnished statements of God's Word are frivolously set aside, and all events in the future relating to the Church are prosperously arranged to suit their own ideas of the fitness of things, or what they deem proper to exist under the moral government of God. Accepting a portion of the truth and ignoring a larger portion, they bend it in a manner to accommodate their favorite system of divinity. Such works as Harris's *Great Commission* (judged worthy of a prize of two hundred guineas), filled with illogical and unscriptural conclusions, are favorites, predicting that which is pleasing to human nature. We are censured because we condemn that which is exceedingly misleading and attributes to the Church that which is the work of Jesus after His Sec. Coming.

Obs. 6. Our doctrine making no imperfect conversion of the world, but allying with it a restoration to a former Paradisaical condition, augments the glory of the Redeemer. It gives Him no hesitating, or even general, possession of the world, but *an entire possession*. It gives Him no world still groaning under the works of the devil, and feeling the direful effects of a constant pervading curse, but a world out of which all evil shall be rooted, in which the works of the devil are destroyed, the curse repealed, all things restored and made new. Our view, therefore, is far from being, as alleged, "derogatory to the power of God and of the Holy Ghost," and "a lowering of Christ," because it demands and exalts this power and Christship. We honor the same now in the measure hitherto graciously experienced, but we look for far more in that which is yet to be realized, and to a degree, so vast in extent, by manifestations of power, of royalty, of the supernatural, that our opponents dare not venture to assume. Our whole trust is in the revealed and abiding Theocratic Ruler, the mighty Restorer.

When the Theocratic ordering is in full sway, then this will be forcibly realized. To this period belong such passages as the following: Ps. 22 : 27, 28, "*All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the Kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the Kingdom is the Lord's; and He is the Governor among the nations.*" Ps. 9 : 1–8 ; Ps. 21 . 7–13, etc.

Obs. 7. Our doctrine makes the saints, counted worthy to inherit the Kingdom with David's Son, *happy participants* in this process of converting the nations of the earth. This opens before us a bright and beautiful aspect of *saintly agency* in the future, when "the elect" are manifested as the revealed kings and priests of the earth.

The reader will find this feature extended in detail, with Scripture proof, under Props. 154 and 156. It is delightful to contemplate, that we who are the redeemed "first-fruits," shall be able practically to manifest our supreme love to God by bringing others to experience its blessings in acknowledgment of the supremacy and majesty of the King.

Obs. 8. Our doctrine of the conversion of the world coincides with the general tenor of the Word, seeing that nowhere do we find the language and appeals so prevailing in modern addresses, sermons, and books pervaded by the spirit of the Whitbyan theory. The Apostles, the first preachers and missionaries, nowhere encourage the Primitive Church in its trials and persecutions by the hope of ultimate and complete success. If it be a truth, as our opponents allege, it certainly was the very one needed in their circumstances. The absence of it strongly corroborates our position.

One of the indirect, but most powerful, evidences of the divine inspiration of the Scripture is found in the fact that nowhere do we find those eulogistic descriptions of "the triumph of the Gospel in subduing the world" which now so largely adorn the eloquence of Whitbyan missionary discourses. Nothing of the kind is exhibited even when reference is made to the rapid extension of the preached Word over the then known world, for the Spirit evidently foresaw, what history testifies to, the ultimate overthrow and fallen condition of the churches, then so widely extended. If the hopes and efforts of believers are to be quickened by such appeals—as men now say—*why were they not given* at a time when Christians endured the severest trials from a persecuting Roman Empire? Surely the lack of these is evidence of the unity of the Scriptures ; it is testimony in favor of its inspiration, seeing that men, intoxicated by success and catching at the predictions relating to an ultimate conversion, would only too gladly have used such pleas, and in their behalf have perverted (as now done) the prophecies themselves, unless withheld by the spirit of truth. The absence of this prediction of success, and the careful reference to prophecy by locating its fulfilment at the same period in the future, and, then superadded, that the reverse of the modern view is most carefully inculcated—all this certainly adds consistency and strength to our line of reasoning. As numerous eminent writers have pointed out, Matt. 24 , Mark 13 ; Luke 21 ; 2 Thess. 2, in themselves considered, are amply sufficient to invalidate the Whitbyan theory. To illustrate how men, by ignoring the facts of history and the direct tenor of prophecy, deal with such passages, we introduce Rev. Robinson, who, in a sermon (Springfield, O., Nov., 1878), asserted that in the first century Christians thought that the world was to be converted immediately, and hence Paul gives 2 Thess. 2 to show that such a conversion was to be delayed. The record shows conclusively that the Thessalonians indulged no such false hope, and Paul does not give his statement to correct any such anticipations, but what he does give does, inferentially, most conclusively (as Bh. McIlvaine and others have observed) overthrow Robinson's view of the conversion of the world in the present dispensation. This passage gives no possible support to a Millen. age from the time of its utterance down to the Sec. Advent, for as Dr. Morehead (art. 4, *Chris. Instructor*, March 13th, 1879) pertinently observes : "The mystery of iniquity was then already working and this was to continue to the Sec. Advent ; that the hindrance removed is not followed by a Millennium but by the Advent ; and that the Advent itself is designed to crush the culmination of iniquity. . . . Thus we are guarded by the Apostle at the beginning,

middle, and end of the whole period. The Mill. cannot come before the Man of Sin, for the mystery of iniquity and the apostasy precede and issue in his revelation. It cannot come after (i.e. before the Advent), for the end of the period is accomplished by the Advent of Christ. We are thus shut up to *the inevitable and irresistible* conclusion, on any fair exegesis of the passage, that if we are ever to have a Mill. of rest for the world, it must be (it cannot otherwise be) after the appearing of the Saviour. With Dr. Lillie, I affirm that if there be a Mill. during this entire age, 'our hope for the world is limited to a Millennium during which Antichrist reigns.'"

Obs. 9. This doctrine of ours prominently holds forth, as a cardinal point, the design of the present dispensation, and insists upon it that wherever the design is specifically mentioned, it is "to gather out a people for His name," "to save them that believe," or to bring appropriated salvation to "the few" in contrast to "the many" who reject it—a process which has been going on uninterruptedly for eighteen centuries.

In direct contrast with this biblical teaching, eminent and eloquent men teach that its design is the reverse, viz., to gather all people, to save the many, to convert all nations. Take e.g. Castellar in *Old Rome and New Italy*, p. 187, and he has this world regenerated by moral, religious, and political truth, so that "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity are not solely evangelical formulas, but also social truths capable of creating a new earth, and of extending above it new heavens of blessed and perennial radiance." Such high-sounding predictions, so forcibly expressed, are not, however, given in accord with God's required Christian repentance and faith, but really flow from unbelief, enlivened by a vivid imagination and a religious fervor, because (p. 185) they result from making miracles and prophecies, not "real acts which actually occurred," but merely "symbols of systems to come, of regeneration periods in the successive life of the spirit and of the planet." The truth is that Castellar's theory is a more unscriptural and a far wilder one than that of the Jesuits, who, as a spur to their exertions, presented the idea of a "universal monarchy"—all nations converted and brought under the Papal sway.

PROPOSITION 177. *This doctrine of the Kingdom will not be received, in faith, by the Church as a body.*

This is distinctly announced in the declarations pertaining *to the period immediately preceding the Advent.* The Church, instead of developing into that condition of knowledge and faith which so many writers confidently predict, is represented as occupying a position *the very opposite.* Jesus significantly (Luke 18 : 8) asks : "*When the Son of man cometh shall He find faith* (the faith) *on the earth?*" i.e. will the Church be in such a condition of trial, of testing, that it will fail to exercise faith in the very provision made for deliverance?[1] Faith in a variety of things may indeed be found, but will it believe in and pray for that "*blessed hope*" *which alone can bring in glorious salvation?*

[1] Dr. Rutter (Roman Catholic), in his *Life of Jesus*, p. 357, on Luke 18 : 8 remarks, that at "the latter end of the world the faithful shall be oppressed by all manner of persecutions," and adds : "An expression descriptive of the extreme rarity of that perfect faith which is necessary to perseverance in prayer. In effect, if we are to judge from the present alarming state of opinionated infidelity in the world, and from the seeming indifference with which many Christians consider the great duty of prayer, is there not reason to fear that mankind are fast approaching to that general apostasy from the faith here foretold by our blessed Redeemer?" So Lange, and many others, properly apply this to the Second Coming of Jesus, and the period immediately preceding and connected with, that Coming. The lack of faith, as the connection demands, is not simply a denial of the Messiah, but a refusal to believe in Him as Coming "speedily" to avenge and deliver His own elect. The question itself, the expressive "*ara*, indeed," the analogy of other Scripture, express a diminution or falling away of faith. Faith has not entirely ceased (for His elect cry to Him to come), but will be greatly diminished, and that just previous to the Parousia.

Obs. 1. The reply is found in various predictions. Even the parable of the ten virgins, united as it is by the word "*then*" with the time of the Second Advent, plainly teaches us how the ignoring of the Coming of the mighty King affects not merely the foolish (i.e. the unprepared), but even the wise (i.e. those otherwise morally qualified) ; and this state arises from *a want of faith in "the things concerning the Kingdom" ;* seeing that a proper conception of the Theocratic Kingdom, as still future, and an understanding of the manner of its re-establishment could not possibly bring them into the situation assigned. A *believer* in the Kingdom, as covenanted, predicted, preached, postponed, connected with the Sec. Advent, etc., in the very nature of the case occupies the position of the Primitive Church, and *looks, longs, and prays for the Coming One.* The faithlessness of the Church—manifested by a disregard to the speedy Advent, by a lack of interest in, and a positive dislike to, the subject, by an unwarranted substitution of other things (as e.g. death, providence, etc.) in place of the appearing of Jesus Christ, by the interposition of a long definite period

between us and the Advent, by decrying the position of watching, study of these things, etc., in others :—clearly springs from *a total misconception of the nature of the Kingdom* that David's Son shall establish here on the earth. Engrafting a mystical or spiritualistic interpretation, in place of the grammatical, upon the Scriptures ; rejecting the belief of pious Jews and of the early Church as erroneous and unworthy of the enlightenment of this age—a Kingdom is set up which being in existence, of course, does not require the faith once *the distinguishing feature and characteristic* of the saints.

Well may we ask those faithless ones who will not believe in the personal Advent of Jesus and His reign with His saints on earth, to look at the First Advent. Is our doctrine more astounding or more testing to faith and reason than that God should humble Himself in the child Jesus, that this Messiah should suffer and die? Our doctrine has nothing so amazing, nothing so humiliating, and consequently those who accept of the facts of the First Advent are inexcusable when they refuse credence to the alleged facts of the Second, when all the latter speak of a coming honor, dominion, and glory.

Obs. 2. Believers in the Word ought to be startled by the solemn, most terrible descriptions of the state of the whole world, as found *in the context and text* of Millennial predictions. The fearful strife, and antagonism with the doom annexed, is stated to arise from "*a gross darkness,*" a perversion of God's truth. Take even that splendid prediction of Isa. 60, and when the glory of the Lord comes (which cannot be confined to the First Advent as the context and parallel passages show) it is added : "*Behold, the darkness shall cover the earth and gross darkness the people.*" The mighty confederation of wickedness, the utterly subdued condition of the few faithful ones, the warnings of sore trial, tribulation given to the Church and exhortations to be faithful, etc., *evidence* the extent and the time of this darkness. Such a state of darkness, of unbelief in God's way of procedure, etc., cannot be suddenly produced ; it takes time and in view of the intellectual and moral nature of man must call to its aid *reasoning, eloquence, and eminent ability.* The opposition that Jesus meets at His Coming, an opposition already previously organized and terrible in persecution, is of such a nature that it cannot arise without *a long introductory process.* Now it is not only infidels and semi-believers who prepare the way for the final culmination of unbelief, but men whose piety and integrity (wise virgins) we would not for a moment question ; men of great learning whom we highly esteem for the knowledge imparted on many subjects, men whose praise is deservedly high in the Church, are also engaged, whether consciously or not, in producing this unfaithless condition. They by their spiritualizing system *are bountifully sowing* the seeds which will surely spring up into *an abundant harvest of unbelief.* The first-fruits of it are already beginning to appear in the scientific and intellectual world ; *the dreadful harvest is still future.* It is saddening to read works, written by talented and good men and containing much that is excellent, which endeavor *to explain away* some of the most precious truths and the most terrible realities, either by confining themselves to one portion of the Word and ignoring another (thus violating the unity of Scripture) ; or, by engrafting another sense not recognized by the laws of language (thus without proof making the Bible an exception to such laws) ; or, by regarding the things predicted, etc., as exaggerated expressions induced by the state of mind in which the writer then was (thus making the communication a human instead of a divine one through human instrumentality) ; or, by

assuming that due allowance must be made for the elevated style of poetry, the vivid imagination, and fanciful language of the Oriental mind (thus ascribing its utterances to human origin) ; or, by declaring that all things must be received and explained according to the teaching of present reason and experience (thus setting up within themselves the standard by which the Word is to be measured, and overlooking that many things relating to the past and future are beyond present personal experience), etc. It is not merely the destructive critic like Strauss, Bauer, or Renan, who undermines the authority of the Bible, but multitudes who would shrink from such a charge, are *virtually doing it* by the principles of interpretation adopted, the doctrine of the Kingdom received, etc., which, when contrasted with the teachings of the Book and reception of the truth by those who had the special privilege of being taught by the Apostles and their immediate successors, lead to a proclamation of a "Gospel of the Kingdom" *widely different* from that contained in the Bible and the early Church. Multitudes, who are no professed unbelievers, reject the plain, contained grammatical sense, and insist upon giving a sense which shall harmonize with their own ideas *of the fitness of things*, thus paving the way for unbelieving license, forging the weapons for unbelief, and preventing the use of a consistent, manly Apologetics. Numerous works are issued from the press which swell the unbelieving ranks and sustain the unbelieving attacks upon the primitive Church, *by openly and directly ridiculing the early hope of the Church* in its view of the Theocratic Kingdom. Able and honest writers, under the influence of misconception and prejudice, have sent forth works *the most insidious and dangerous*, pre-eminently adapted to crush what little faith exists in various denominations respecting this Kingdom. Such writers make the prophecies conditional ; heap the curses on the Jews and the blessings upon the Gentiles ; hesitate not to mutilate and transfer predictions directly associated with the Jewish nation; make God's throne in the third heaven to be represented by David's ; spiritualize all, only so that it can be applied to the Church ; scoff at what they are pleased to call "a Jewish Kingdom ;" ignore the personal Advent of Jesus Christ, etc. Many of these works are regarded, owing to the reputation of the authors, *as standards*, and the writers are loudly lauded and loaded with titles of honor. Alas, that friends of Jesus, and not enemies, aid *in the destruction of faith* in the promises of God ; alas, that friends as well as enemies, are engaged in administering the *soporifics* which must inevitably lead to the sleeping, unbelieving, lamentable state which is predicted. Let no one censure us for the plainness of speech employed, for the time has arrived when faithfulness to the Word and Church demands a frank and candid statement of facts and their dangerous tendency.

The latter class of writings are to be found in reviews, periodicals, etc. Works written by talented and pious authors of this class are painfully illustrated in Dr. Brown's *Christ's Sec. Coming : Will it be Pre-Millennial?* or in Fairbairn *On Prophecy*, or in Dr. Berg's *The Sec. Advent of Christ not Pre-Millennial*, etc. References under various Props. are made to others, but these will suffice to indicate the talent thus directed to an overthrow of the primitive and commanded posture of faith and watching. Multitudes of works take passages directly referring to the Sec. Advent and deliberately pervert their designed teaching, as e.g. illustrated in Jay (*Exercises*, vol. 2, p. 24), who interprets Mark 13 : 33, "*Take ye heed, watch and pray : for ye know not when the time is*," by no reference whatever to the time stated in the context, but informs his readers that it relates (1) to the time of duty, (2) the time of danger, (3) the time of trouble, (4) the time of death. Alas ! Ten thousand thousand just as fanciful applications are given in the present religious literature.

Obs. 3. This want of faith is also caused by reason wrongfully rejecting the past and the future of this Kingdom. In reference to the past, it forgets the primary step of noticing *when* it was established, *how* it progressed and incorporated the Davidic line, *why* it was overthrown, and *how constantly* the Prophets predicted its (same Kingdom) restoration in a glorious form under the Messiah, and in immediate relationship with the Jewish nation. It closes its eyes against *the preachiug of this identical Kingdom* (indisputably proven, see e.g. Props. 70–75), and the valid reasons assigned for *its postponement* until the times of the Gentiles are ended. The past, even *in its naked historical connection*, is not received, but in place of it reason is put under the guidance of an Origenistic rule of interpretation which makes the Old Test. say *one thing* respecting the Kingdom but mean *another;* and which causes the Prophets to predict, in the grammatical sense, *one thing* (believed in by the ancients) concerning the Kingdom but which must be understood *differently*. Again, in reference to the future, this Kingdom being still the subject of prediction and promise, and hence must be received by faith (for all that we can possibly know of its re-establishment is only found in the Word), we have eminent writers objecting to the reception of the plain grammatical meaning of the promises precisely on the same ground occupied by the most ultra unbelief, viz., that it brings forth *too much of the Supernatural element*. Reason they tell us cannot accept of this doctrine, for it is not credible that such occurrences as are related to the restoration of the Kingdom can possibly take place. Fully indorsing (as we have shown in the previous Proposition) Dr. Alexander's saying (*Evid. of Christianity*, p. 10) that "truth and reason are so intimately connected that they can never with propriety be separated," yet at the same time things which refer to the future must be accepted *solely* because God announces them, and their *reasonableness* must be observed *by the connection* which they sustain to the Divine Purpose, to the divine ability to perform, and to the necessity of their occurring in order to fulfil God's prophets, and to secure redemption in the form needed by the world. In relation to things still future, it is to be regretted that the leaven of infidelity has pervaded the Church to such an extent that in this particular, *many exalt reason above faith*. While reason has its appropriate sphere in the investigation of truth, and is necessarily allied with faith, yet in things pertaining to futurity we are entirely dependent for knowledge *on Him who is omniscient*, and reason must occupy a subordinate place, willing to accept of and to be guided by, divine revelation. It is sad to reflect that Christians refuse to believe in the fulfilment of prophecy, in its true grammatical sense, in this Kingdom, because in their estimation it involves *a mode of procedure* which seems to them incredible and contrary to the nature of things. Having already met the objection urged by reason against the Supernatural and miraculous, it is sufficient to direct such a class to the fact that *in no other way is it possible* to fulfil the Millennial descriptions. *How* can the curse be repealed; *how* can death be overcome; *how* can all the fearful evils pertaining to man and nature be removed; *how* can the unspeakably great blessings be obtained: all of which are to be realized in this Kingdom under Messiah's reign, *without a mighty display of Supernatural power* beyond anything that the world has ever witnessed, and beyond the understanding of weak, mortal man with his limited powers. If there is a truth conspicuously displayed in Holy Writ, it is, that this Kingdom, the tabernacle of David now in ruins but then gloriously rebuilt

under David's Son, cannot be manifested without the most wonderful displays of Almighty energy. Strange to say, many who refuse credence in this Kingdom and ridicule it, are willing to accept of the Supernatural in the birth of Isaac and of Christ, of the miracles of the Old and New Testaments, but unwilling to accept of the Supernatural and miraculous *pertaining to this Kingdom.* From whence springs this reluctance which involves *an inconsistency* of position? Do they simply believe the former because the past is fulfilled and has become history, and do they reject the latter because being unfulfilled it is an open question whether it ever will be in the manner grammatically expressed? *Is this trust in the Word of the Lord? Is it even reasonable,* seeing that faith in the past fulfilment is based on the same antecedently given Word, and should lead *to implicit and extended faith* in the things relating to the future. How painful it is to find e.g. such a talented writer as Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 820, etc.) tell us respecting Zech. 12, that God's providence with the Jews has rendered the fulfilment of the prediction "*manifestly impossible,*" and that "*it does violence to reason*" to expect a restoration of the families indicated by the prophecy. And this from one who believes that (as recorded Matt. 3 : 9) God would have been able, if requisite, "*of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.*" The same line of reasoning would hold equally good in the case of Sarah, of the Virgin Mary, etc. No! with belief in the truthfulness and Almighty power of God, as evidenced in the past astonishing provisions for carrying out a definitely stated Divine Plan, we can surely stay ourselves *in faith,* that the *same* power—which now so amazingly for over eighteen hundred years preserves the Jewish nation (as Moses thousands of years ago foretold), and keeps Jerusalem itself (as Jesus predicted) under continued Gentile rule—*will be equal to the fulfilment of every prediction.* Such lack of faith, such a process of reasoning is dangerous; for it invalidates whatever apologies or accommodations may be presented to excuse the non-fulfilment, the truthfulness of the Word, and brings it down to a human level. Numerous illustrations might be adduced of this method of dealing with the Word, of receiving just as much as suits the taste, opinions, system, etc., of the interpreter, or of explaining it most arbitrarily to accommodate it in some way with a theory. In the eagerness to maintain the position of an advocate, seeing how largely this Kingdom relates to the future and is consequently the subject of prophecy, one of the most prominent of our opponents (Dr. Brown, *Christ's Sec. Coming,* p. 60) lays down the faithless principle "*that doctrines are not to be built upon prophetic or symbolical Scripture*" calling it "*an old maxim in divinity.*" He thus perverts the old maxim, "Theologia prophetica non est argumentiva" (prophetic theology is not argumentative), which *confirms* our position that we are to receive the specific announcements of prophecy respecting the future as given by God and beyond our power to discern; and he rejects by its one-sided adoption, if logically carried out, some of the most precious doctrines pertaining to Redemption, as the Sec. Advent, resurrection, reign, glory, inheritance of the saints, renewal of the earth, etc., *all of which are subjects of prophecy.* While this is so, yet in relation to the Kingdom itself and the Advent which is to introduce it, reason, if it desires to know something of the expediency and reasonableness of the establishment of such a Kingdom under David's Son, will fall back upon the preliminarily given Theocracy, study its nature, design, connections, and then regard the utterances of the Prophets in the

light of *the Divine Purpose* previously indicated and determined. Prophecy thus finds itself confirmed by *a solid foundation of noteworthy facts*, which calls for unbounded faith in the things still future. Past and present fulfilment, in behalf of a divinely ordained Plan, insures future fulfilment in the interest of *the same purpose*, and hence the extraordinary consistency (now by many called "weakness") of the early Church in its belief based upon a union of reason and faith, of knowledge and trust.

In the attacks upon us, the foundations upon which our system of faith is based are entirely ignored, and the early Church view is explained away as the result of enthusiasm. Thus e.g. Prof. Hopkins in the *N. Y. Evangelist*, Feb. 6th, 1879, has the "Historical conditions of the Sec. Advent enthusiasm," and attributes Pre-Mill. views to the conditions of society and of nations in the recurrence of natural phenomena, political disturbances, revolutions, etc. (and in his eagerness to make out a case, actually introduces the views of Post-Millenarians as identical with ours—thus showing that he never studied the subject). The spirit of the writer is self-evident; for passing by the Scripture teaching respecting our doctrine and posture of waiting, he claims that it is merely enthusiasm excited by the phenomena and disorders mentioned, and concludes by pronouncing the Prophetic Conference, held at New York in Dr. Tyng's church, "an assembly of *heated enthusiasts*," who expected the Coming of the Lord as "imminent;" and to give his defamatory opinion some kind of a scriptural aspect, he places the restoration of the Jews as *a preliminary* to the Sec. Advent and asserts that it will require "*several centuries*" to bring about such a restoration, so that "it is still true that they (Pre-Millenarians) and all now on earth, who love the Lord Jesus, will have been many years in Paradise before that great and notable day of the Lord come"—extending its delay "*through the coming ages.*" How reconcile this with the commanded posture of watching? Is this not expressly teaching "*My Lord delayeth His Coming*"? Is it not unbelief?

Obs. 4. The Old and New Testaments describe *the same Kingdom*—the same Theocratic arrangement under David's Son. All the writers, separated by centuries, independent of each other, residing in various countries but still under the influence of the same Spirit, locate this Kingdom in the future, link it with the Sec. Advent, and agree in portraying its distinguishing peculiarities and blessings. In a comparison of their writings, entering even into details, there is *no contradiction* between them. Even the diversity of style, the different modes of relation and shades of character, only increases the value of the testimony, indicating an essential quality in witnesses, that of entire independence from others in giving evidence. The disagreement is found in the interpreters and *not* in the writers of the Bible: for the latter *all* start from the same point, holding up the same covenant as an everlasting one under which we receive the promises, and *all* declare the same provisionary and preparatory process, and *all* insist upon the same literal fulfilment. Harmony of design, unity of purpose is seen throughout their writings, but only so long—as the infidel even has forcibly stated and proven—*as the plain grammatical sense is retained.* Forsake this sense, and then, notwithstanding all the protests to the contrary, *this harmony is violated, this unity is destroyed* to the confirmation of unbelief. If, as multitudes do, we reject the literal and engraft a spiritual meaning foreign to the common usage of language, it may well be asked *how it comes* that all the writers employ language which in its literal adaptation distinctly teaches the Kingdom that we advocate: and that they did not use the language, ideas and reasonings *now so prevalent* and first introduced about the third century. Why this disruption of a marvellous unity? Is it really necessary for the sake of the truth that such *a transformation* of meaning—so hostile to these "Jewish conceptions"—

should spring up and be cherished in "the consciousness of the Church?" Is it requisite that such *an antagonism* should exist between the plain language of the Bible and that of the dominant Theology? No! never, for this would at once argue *imperfection* in God's Word, a mere accommodation to human weakness, and that He, the God of all truth, purposely led a host of believing people (both Jews and Christians) *into gross error* pertaining to the leading doctrine of the Bible. Before such a change of meaning can be adopted, it must be shown *that God Himself* directed such a transformation of the import and signification of language; *that He cancelled the covenant* made with David and the elect position of the Jewish nation; *that He recalled* the predictions of prophets, and *that He altered* the Divine Plan originally proposed. When we ask *why* this introduction of a sense so radically diverse from that entertained for thousands of years (and which, the latter, was a source of confident hope and joy to so many believers), the answer is given, that as the Kingdom as predicted by the prophets was not literally established at the First Advent, the Christian Church being then instituted, the Church *must be* the Kingdom intended. Upon this *presumption*—seized and used against Christianity by the destructive school—the superstructure of a Kingdom now present is reared, and the language of covenant, prophet, Jesus, and Apostle *is spiritualized to fit the assumed theory*. And in the contest it is strange to find that men materially differing in the use they make of it (as e.g. the author of *Ecce Homo* on the one side, and the writer of *Ecce Deus* on the other) still agree in taking *for granted a premise utterly unproven*, actually resisted by the Word, and which in its nature and tendency makes the Scriptures and Theology irreconcilable. Did the Jewish nation obey *the condition* of repentance upon which the Kingdom was offered to them? Did the disciples preach a Kingdom which was, in their ignorance, "*a mere chimera?*" Did Jesus predict the continued desolation of the Kingdom *until* His return the Second time? These and numerous other questions suggested by our previous Propositions must *first* be reasonably and scripturally answered before the far-reaching and destructive premise, now so confidently paraded and intrenched in the Church, can be received by the careful student of God's Word. With such a sandy foundation to stand on, with conclusions drawn from a false construction of the leading doctrine of the Bible: with a host of inferences derived from such a source making the faith of pious Jews, of John the Baptist, of the disciples of Jesus, misconceptions of the real truth—need we be surprised at *the want of faith* in this Kingdom of the Messiah. A most fruitful source of infidelity in Church and world is the making the Church the predicted Kingdom of God instead of *a preparatory stage* for the revelation of this Kingdom. Apologetics has not, and cannot, fairly meet destructive critics *so long* as it retains such a theory, for the latter triumphantly points to the plain teachings of the prophets, the equally plain belief of the early Church, and *contrasts* it with present teaching and belief, and *justly claims an irreconcilable antagonism*. The Church has not and cannot have faith in the Kingdom *so long* as it holds to a view which of necessity destroys all hope of its ever being realized. This lack of faith in a firmly covenanted and oath-bound Kingdom is based on a false premise, and then sustained (as it only can be) by a mystical or spiritual interpretation. It is so arbitrary and unscientific that it cannot *even define* the Kingdom without having a variety of meanings or definitions. It claims, in order to make its conclusions the stronger, to be

guided by the Spirit. But a change has taken place; for in the contest now waging between destructive criticism and the friends of the Bible, the original sources of Christianity are laid bare and examined as they perhaps were never before studied. The lofty claims of divine origin in theories are sifted, and where antagonism is found and proven, these very claims create *a revulsion* in the thinking portion of the community. Rationalism properly insists upon the Bible being explained in its doctrinal aspects, etc., by *the universally received laws of language*, but the immense mass of the Church has cut itself loose from *the plain grammatical sense*, and this has led to a state of uncertainty in the minds of many, which the accumulated theological learning of generations, drifting in the same channel, has been utterly unable, with all its eloquent pleadings, beautiful thoughts, metaphysical ability, and incorporated truths, to remove. Leaving the well-beaten path trodden by believing Jews and early Christians as entirely "too Jewish" for Gentiles; ignoring "the letter" as "too carnal and sensual" for spiritual reception—the Kingdom itself is dwarfed down from the magnificent proportions given to it by the prophets to make it fit the fighting, struggling, suffering Church. From this standpoint it is not surprising to read the introductory sentence of the Duke of Somerset to his recent work (*Christian Theol. and Mod. Scepticism*): "It is humiliating to be obliged to confess that after eighteen hundred years of Christian teaching, man has made no advance in certainty of religious knowledge." The duke, whose language has been unduly censured, evidently bases his utterance upon *the palpable differences* now existing between the prevailing theology of the day and the belief once so prevalent in the early Church. The degree of certainty that we now possess is solely derived from *the plain grammatical sense* of the Scriptures, and *so long* as there is a continued rejection of this sense and the substitution of others, just *so long* will uncertainty continue and increase. We believe the Word because the astonishing Plan, so well adapted to secure the redemption of the world, has been all along verified by facts, attested by history and the experience of man, *just as they stand recorded*. The doctrine of the Kingdom, being the burden of the Word and including the blessings of salvation, is no exception to such faith, as is shown by past and present fulfilments and provisions. To exercise no faith in a Kingdom once firmly believed in by saints and proclaimed by them under divine sanction, is at once, with the weak and often contradictory reasons assigned, *sufficient cause* to many for denying the authority of the Scriptures. The large body of the Church is occupying this very position: the Kingdom believed in and so highly eulogized is *the direct opposite* of that once universally received by the faith of the Church. The predictions, therefore, which intimate such a change of faith in the Church *are rapidly verifying* before our eyes, and *correspondingly* no interest is felt in the Advent of the great King by whom this Kingdom is to be re-established. The extravagant claims set up for the Church as the Kingdom is bearing its fruit *in the denial of the blessed covenanted Kingdom of David's Son*, under the mistaken notion that by so doing they really honor the Son. But no one who ventures upon such a method has been able to designate in what particulars this supposed Kingdom meets the requirements of the covenant which specifies the Theocratic throne and Kingdom of David as the one denoted, excepting only by employing the most arbitrary exposition which by acceptance degrades the ancient faith to the lowest level of error and fanaticism.

One reason for this lack of faith in the Church results from eminent divines, who hold to the cardinal outlines of our doctrine being afraid to express them with a becoming freedom, or giving but a faint and indistinct utterance, or when declaring their faith neutralizing the whole by endeavoring to incorporate the leaven or development theory. From those who ought to give no "uncertain sound," we have but vagueness or silence. We could give several striking illustrations, but, for the sake of others, forbear. To their own Master they must give account for the influence exerted; but the fear may be stated, that while the dread of controversy, antagonism, loss of patronage, etc., causes the adoption of such a procedure, the pleasantness of the present life is no compensation for "the loss" that will be sustained because of a concealment, or neutralizing presentation, of truth. The number that occupy this position is not a small one, and the plea of "prudence" is presented in order to shield themselves from the charge of not proclaiming these doctrines, and thus warning the Church and world. What weight such a plea will have with the Judge Himself, we leave them to estimate after contrasting it with His expressed commands.

Obs. 5. Another serious cause of unbelief in this Kingdom arises from the infirmity of human nature, its reliance upon authorities outside of the Bible. With perverted ideas of the real position and design of the Church and this dispensation, they will accept of the formularies of some denomination, or the doctrinal basis of some reformer, or the theological system of some prominent divine or school, and with scholastic dogmatism lay *more stress* on these than upon the Scriptures (although professing that the same are based on them), and make them *the standard* of appeal and of faith; and because these ignore the Kingdom, designate it as "Jewish," and accept of the Church-Kingdom view, they do the same. Admitting the great value, the priceless influence of many human compositions, yet in our search after the truth they should not stand *between us and God's own revelation;* for as the tree, however lovely and fruitful, standing between us and the sun will cast its shadow, so, more or less, will be the shading, the interception of light when humanity, however sincere and honest, is placed between us and the divine truth. The source of all true knowledge of the Kingdom is found *alone* in God's Word, and to that Word, if wise and prudent, we should come for instruction and guidance, seeing that the words of God are *weightier and more truthful* than those of men, however pious and learned. Indeed, in not a few cases, the lack of faith can be traced to a certain disposition of the heart, mentioned by Jesus (John 5 : 44), "*How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor which cometh from God only?*" In this day of unbelief and reproach cast upon our doctrine, it requires *courage* to oppose the sweeping popular current of belief on the subject. Especially when a return to the early Church faith causes the charge of "credulity," "fanaticism," "heresy," etc., to come from the multitude, and even *from brethren* united by the same denominational ties. How many have had their attention directed to this subject, have promised investigation, have been persuaded of the truth, but have *recoiled*, fearful of the loss of reputation, influence, honor, and preferments. No one, either in this country or in Europe, who has prominently held to the primitive faith, *has escaped the censures* of numerous writers, while some ecclesiastical bodies have even suggested, under the ascendency of confessional faith, excommunication. Strange, indeed, that those who make so much of Church confession and authority should forget that our doctrine, if it is to be judged by such criterions, has decidedly *the greatest weight* upon its side, owing to *the universality* with which it was received and perpetuated by the Jewish and Gentile churches established by the Apostles and their immediate successors. If honest,

however, with ourselves and with God, human approval, however desirable and agreeable, should *weigh nothing* against truth, especially *when warned* that there will be a great departure from the truth as the times of the Gentiles draw to a close. The injury that error may do to others, the use to which it may be applied by others, should deter us from its known embrace, should urge us to a free examination of the Word lest we be found entertaining it. Error is far from being harmless to ourselves, for our future elevation and corresponding happiness largely depends upon our acceptance of and faith in all the truths given to us. The test is stated by Jesus (Matt. 5 : 19), and it follows that we cannot be too careful in our doctrinal position, especially when it has respect to so vital a point as the Kingdom of God, the Gospel of which we are to preach and receive. So perverse, however, is human nature, that while a party occupies the attitude assigned in the first part of the observation, another will take directly the opposite one, viz., that they care little *for doctrine* being satisfied with *practical piety*. To this class, who do not want doctrine but piety, it may be said that two extremes are to be avoided ; first, theoretical knowledge of doctrine *without* practical application of the same, or personal piety conjoined ; second, piety isolated from doctrine, just as if it could exist without *a previous knowledge* of the truth. The persons who make this objection against our doctrine are the very ones who deal largely in doctrine concerning the Church-Kingdom, Millennium, etc., in prayer, preaching, writing, etc., but as soon as something is said in conflict with *their own doctrinal* position *then* we need no doctrine. Besides this, the fact is overlooked that piety has regard only to the personal qualifications of the individual *for* the Kingdom, it cannot change or alter the Divine Purpose *respecting* the Kingdom. It may, if wanting, postpone the Kingdom as was the case with the Jews ; it may, if it is to be possessed by all who shall become inheritors or rulers, delay the Kingdom *until* the number of the chosen, elect body is completed, but it *cannot affect* the nature, design, etc., of the Kingdom itself. The doctrine of the Kingdom is the teaching of God concerning it, and is not derived from the piety of men, but from God's Word.

Obs. 6. Many refuse faith in the doctrine of this Kingdom because of the claimed piety, sanctity, prayerful spirit, gifts of the Holy Ghost, etc., bestowed upon those *who have turned away* from the ancient belief. Multitudes are swayed by this sentiment, and numerous illustrations might be adduced where it is gravely offered as a motive for the rejection of this Kingdom. Alas, history gives but too many instances which prove that eminent piety, or goodness of heart *cannot be substituted for knowledge*, for it has been too often allied with error (e.g. various denominational doctrines in direct opposition to each other, etc.), and with severity, injustice, and persecution (e.g. Luther and Zwingli, Calvin and Servetus, Knox and Balfour, etc.). If this is to be *the criterion* of the doctrine of the Kingdom—while making no claims to extraordinary sanctity, but realizing that after all that we can do we still remain unprofitable servants, and while making no great professions of humility, seeing that to God we stand or fall, and that professions are no index of character, yet—we may point to the faithful believers in this Kingdom who suffered persecution and death, to the long list of distinguished confessors, etc., who have manifested a consistency of life, integrity of character, love to God and man, etc., which has endeared them in the memory of the Church. Without

calling into question the undisputed piety of many of our opponents, without making (although numbering many martyrs among us), martyrdom illogically a proof of doctrine, without denying that doctrine and piety ought to be connected to make the former more efficient, it is sufficient to say that piety itself may become *enlightened* by additional truth or become *deformed* by ignorance and superstition. More than this: this claim is often put forth—mere pretension—*in behalf* of dangerous error and systems the most antagonistic. We see it existing in every heresy from the earliest ages down to the present—towering forth in Roman Catholicism and lifting its head in the latest development of fanaticism (as e.g. Mormonism)—appealing, in order to gain strength, to a natural, honorable feeling in man. It is *a cheap claim*, easily produced, and if persistently pressed by numerous names and quasi authority, it will impress the minds not only of the ignorant but even of the learned. While not disputing, in many cases, the sincerity and honesty of the parties who present it, yet a dispassionate view both of them and the contradictory results flowing from them, evidence to us that it is *no criterion* of the truth, being frequently imaginary and often designedly—from misconception—advanced to protect *the weakness* of a doctrinal position. Gratefully acknowledging the connection that holiness, prayer, and divine influence with the truth has in our study of the Bible—that they are necessary to a comprehension of the whole truth (for the meek He will guide, etc.), yet we positively object to our making the experience of man *the measure* by which we are authoritatively to judge the Bible. Experience whatever it may be, moral qualifications however they may aid in understanding the truth, do not and cannot *change the doctrines* as contained in Holy Writ. Admitting the piety and goodness of others, their statements respecting the contents of the Bible are to be accepted (as e.g. Prop. 11), only in so far as they accurately and fully *correspond* with the Book. Hence, e.g. we must reject as utterly untenable that philosophical gloss which is so boldly and ably advocated by a class of Apologists (in order to apologize for the early Church belief against the Rationalistic party), that the real truth respecting the Kingdom was to be developed "in the consciousness of the Church." And again: this is a virtual indorsement of the semi-infidel and infidel statement that "doctrines are of little importance if the life is only right." *How* can the teaching of things which God alone knows and therefore reveals, be transformed into truth by mere human agency; and *how* important is the most valuable life in comparison with the Divine Purpose which involves the truthfulness and honor of God and the glory of His Son? Yet to produce unbelief or indifference to our doctrine, it is asserted by many that it is, in comparison with other things, unessential and unimportant. The great leading doctrine of the Bible is thus designated, *but only* (for their own theories of the kingdom, with varied meanings and definitions are alleged to be essential and important), to frame an argument and excite prejudice against us. We freely admit that so far as the individual personally is concerned, he might know all truth, and yet without a personal appropriation of the same, it would do him no good. In this respect, of course, it is more important to experience the power of truth, and it is precisely for this reason that we also urge others to accept of this doctrine, because by so doing they increase their own appreciation of God's truth, confirm their hope in covenant promises, open the Scriptures to a better understanding, give due prominency to the Sec. Advent, encourage themselves to culti-

vate the Christian graces to secure an inheritance in the Kingdom, accept it as a motive to patience, mortification, comfort, etc., and place themselves in the commanded position of servants looking, watching, praying, loving, desiring the appearing of the King and Kingdom. Alas, how often are we asked, "what is the practical worth of your doctrine," *just as if God's utterances are to be measured by man's practice.* Fortunately, even to meet such an invalid objection, aside from the numerous (see App. to Dr. Seiss's *Last Times*, ch. 1, sec. 10, for Scripture references), declarations of its practical value, the very fact that it is *pre-eminently* designed to warn and guard us against placing ourselves in the position stated in the Proposition—this alone is amply sufficient to vindicate its preciousness to the believer. Can the man who holds firmly to such a Kingdom, himself feel so little interest in the coming Bridegroom as to fall asleep, to neglect preparation for His coming, to urge others not to expect His Coming, to tell the world that it is still distant, etc.? Can such an one aid in advancing unbelief until it finally bursts in fury upon a Church *unprepared* for a terrible persecution? The time will *surely come when the neglect of this doctrine will be bitterly regretted.* In the mean time, no effort is spared to make it something of little estimation *and even contemptible.* Men tell us that it is not "*the Gospel*," and that it ought not to be preached *from the pulpit.* Such forget that the Gospel is "*the Gospel of the Kingdom*;" that the early preachers as Philip "*preached the things concerning the Kingdom*;" and that all the Apostles *proclaimed the same*, so that the greatest of them (Paul) said: "*I have gone preaching the Kingdom of God.*" To leave out the Kingdom and substitute the means for obtaining the Kingdom for the Kingdom itself, is *only a small part of* "*the Gospel.*" The insincerity, however, of the objection, urged only to palliate lack of faith, is seen by the parties, who present it, proclaiming *without stint* their own views and theories of the Kingdom. Ministers tell us, as if it were an ample excuse for neglect, that they are to preach "*Christ and Him crucified*," *and* "*win souls to Christ.*" The Apostles did this, and *at the same time* preached "the Kingdom." It is very doubtful whether those who thus object really appreciate the deep significancy of the word "*Christ*," the name pointing to "Thy Kingdom come" in His being "the Anointed One," the covenanted King. To preach "Christ" as the prophets and Apostles announced Him *demands a knowledge of this Kingdom* (Prop. 205), for which He is the appointed, ordained One; and thus having the proper understanding of His covenanted relationship to it as "the Anointed One," we can the better appreciate Him as "the crucified One," through whose perfect obedience and sacrifice the requisite provisions are made *by which* the Kingdom can be most gloriously re-established under an immortal David's Son, and by which we can become "heirs of the Kingdom." Glorying in the cross of Christ, exulting in the crucified One, as *essentials* in the Redemptive process, we receive these, like Paul did, as important parts of the Gospel, but not as *the whole Gospel*, for without the Divine Purpose exhibited in the Kingdom the death of Christ would lose much of its significance. Paul by no means confined himself to the name and death of Jesus Christ but showed, as his writings *abundantly evidence*, the relationship that these sustained to our obtaining the Kingdom and to the Kingdom itself. Besides this, let us remind the reader that there can be but *one Gospel of the Kingdom, the same* proclaimed by the prophets, preached by John the Baptist, Jesus, the seventy disciples, and the twelve

Apostles. Now the Gospel of the Kingdom that we hold *is precisely the one* held by the Primitive Church ; and its good news is dependent upon *the covenants confirmed by oath, the predictions* of the prophets, *the declarations* of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, and *the provisions* made by God in Christ for the Kingdom. "The Gospel of the Kingdom" as now generally entertained is *diverse* from that *once held* by the Church, and it really becomes a serious question, no matter how much even of life imparting power by faith in Christ etc., there may be attached to it, whether men are not *amenable and will not suffer loss* by such a perversion of "the Gospel." Especially since there is no difficulty in understanding what the Gospel of the Kingdom is, if we *only allow* the Scriptures to speak in their naked, natural, grammatical sense, and receive that meaning so apparent upon its surface as did the early Church. Indeed when tracing the preaching of this Gospel and seeing how many varieties of Gospels have been introduced through a mystical and spiritual interpretation and with them corresponding faith and hopes, the warnings of the New Test. *against the foreseen innovations* obtain special force. The truth is, that the very *plainness*, the remarkable *simplicity* of "the Gospel of the Kingdom" is its *chiefest obstacle* in the minds of many, for while it may do for ignorant Jews and unlettered fishermen, etc., as "a harmless error" adapted to their capacities and circumstances, it is not *sufficiently refined*, etc., for the enlightenment afterward bestowed. Do we exaggerate or are we too severe when such a scholarly and amiable man as Prof. Bush (*On the Mill.*) influenced by theory, can represent the early Church faith in the Kingdom as such?

Obs. 7. What must we say then to that large class of professed believers, who establish unbelief in themselves and others by denouncing our doctrine of the Kingdom (under the garb of superior piety, spirituality, etc.), as "*sensual*," "*carnal*," "*fleshly*," etc. Do they not see that by so doing they not only *caricature* the faith of the early Church at the expense of Christianity, but direct *a deadly blow* at the preaching of the Kingdom as given in the opening of the New Testament by which the knowledge, integrity, etc., of the first preachers, specially and divinely sent forth, are sacrificed? A definite Gospel of the Kingdom was proclaimed by John the Baptist, disciples, etc., and this is *the identical Gospel* that we still hold to, sealed and attested by the death and resurrection of Jesus, confirmed by the predictions of postponement fulfilled before our eyes. Now if this Gospel of the Kingdom is thus stigmatized, what is it else but denouncing holy men of old who were *specially commissioned* to preach it? What is it, but *the denouncing of the faith* of saints, who had particular instruction and divine guidance, and whose message concerning the Kingdom was confirmed by miraculous power? What must we think of a doctrine of the Kingdom which is erected only *by invalidating the character* of the first ministers? It is amazing, and illustrative of the power of preconceived opinion and unrelenting prejudice, that men of the greatest ability and piety, are engaged in this *destructive work* when heaping such terms upon us. If Jesus, as He Himself states, was sent to preach the Kingdom and preached it through His disciples ; if the good things predicted by the prophets are contained in the Kingdom thus forming "the Gospel or good news of the Kingdom," let such before they censure us, or refuse to believe, explain *how it comes* that all at that period held to the Kingdom as expressed in the grammatical sense of the Old Test., and that

such a belief continued to exist uninterruptedly for centuries? When this explanation is rationally given, without reflecting upon God who gives the Gospel and commands all men to receive it (which can only be just if the sense alluded to is the true one), without calling into question the respect and reverence due to persons who ought to have known what they preached, *then* it will be time to sit in condemnatory judgment over us. Considering the foundation of our doctrine, established upon the plain grammatical sense of covenant and prophets, the consistent historical account of the Theocratic order, the belief and preaching of the early Church, those men (accepting the Bible) certainly assume *a heavy responsibility* who speak and write concerning it so disrespectfully and reproachfully.[1] What if it should after all be God's own arrangement—as we have shown it is—how can they excuse *the terms of dishonor* heaped upon His own Divine Plan? Surely prudence, if nothing higher, should cause such to avoid offensive epithets (which are always indications of weakness and lack of solid argument) to a doctrine thus contained (in the sense we maintain and admitted even by our opponents), in the Bible, and once the faith and hope of the churches, lest peradventure they be found *resisting* the truth of God. The sarcasms against "the Jewish," "degrading," "worldly" faith of the Primitive Church come with bad grace from *religious* writers; and if the evil were confined to them alone might not result in much injury, but such terms prejudice the multitude against the Kingdom. When found in systems of Theology, etc., used as text-books, need we wonder at the influence and extent of unbelief. The Jews misapprehended *how and when* the Kingdom was to be brought in, but it is left to Gentiles—also professing faith in the Scriptures—not only in their "high-mindedness" to misconceive *the how and when, but to deny the Kingdom itself.* Wiser than Jews divinely guided, more enlightened than disciples who preached under the great Teacher the Kingdom, claiming more understanding of the Kingdom than men who were directly taught by the Apostles, they profess in a meridian blaze of light, that *that which God has plainly promised and sworn to He does not mean* but something else which the ingenuity and wisdom of man attaches to it. It is surely surprising that intelligent men (as e.g. Prof. Garbett in *Bampton Lectures*), when endeavoring to make the Personal reign of Jesus on the earth (although admitting it to be "*venerable from its unquestionable antiquity,*" and *traceable to the apostles,*") *degrading* and a Coming again in "*a new humiliation*" (the Bible says "in glory,") with "*a secular kingdom*" (i.e. the covenanted Kingdom, the Theocracy), should declare that "those *carnal* interpretations of the Kingdom of the Messiah, which formed in the Jewish mind the great obstacle to the reception of the Lord, and which nothing but the searching fires of persecution and the gradual opening of their eyes to the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom, seems to have eradicated from the heart *of even the Apostles themselves.*" What satisfaction such a passage *must afford to the infidel,* for here we have the acknowledgment that our view was at one time at least entertained by the Apostles, who preached it under Christ, and that it was eradicated (?) not by the truth, instruction, but by persecution which gradually opened their eyes although *inspired* teachers. In what a position of weakness, etc., this places *inspired* men; and if persecution had this effect upon them *how comes it* that their churches and successors who also endured persecution should fail to have *their eyes opened?* It is a line of argumentation *unworthy* of enlightened piety, seeing that it undermines the teach-

ing and authority of the divinely commissioned and instructed Apostles, and brings into contempt the fervent faith of the churches established by them. Any theory, no matter by whom advocated, that introduces *so fatal an antagonism* between primitive and present faith, is to be discarded as *irreconcilable* with the truth. But instead of this, the masses follow such reasoning and the substitutions intended, led by the authority, reputation, etc. of others, and swayed by the reproach cast upon our faith.[2]

[1] Whatever views are entertained respecting the Kingdom, one thing must be self-evident to the reflecting mind, viz., that because, as our leading critics freely admit, however they may explain or apologize for it, the literal sense does teach the Kingdom and the Advent ushering it in, etc., it is *the part of prudence* not to stigmatize it as "carnal," etc. Suppose it is spiritual and that another sense is to be received, *then* this even is derogatory to the Word giving it "a carnal" element, etc. But suppose the Kingdom is as we represent it, and as many eminent and pious men have held, then, there evidently will be a disparaging of God's own appointments, a deriding of our inheritance and of things pertaining to the glory of Jesus Christ. Prudence, in view of the language, suggests carefulness. We fear that many who professed themselves to have been called to preach "the Gospel of the Kingdom," will ultimately find themselves to have preached "another Gospel," mere human opinions.

[2] Some recent writers, seeing the inconsistency involved in a wholesale condemnation of our doctrine, make concessions that are favorable in so far as a Churchly position is concerned. Thus Dr. Patterson (*Princeton Review*, 1878) in an art. against us, concedes that it is not "heresy," indorsing the following: "This doctrine (says the latest Church His. which has come into our hands) though ultimately rejected by the Roman Catholic Church, was too frequently held by the early Fathers to be ranked as a heresy." (Comp. our Props. on the history of the doctrine, 70-78.)

Obs. 8. But to insure the demolition of our doctrine, to make it unpalatable to others, argument is laid aside and recourse is had *to personal abuse.* We are sorry even to be compelled to notice these attacks, but since the most eminent and pious men, through weakness, have in standard works, histories, etc., referred to us as "weak," "unbalanced," "credulous," "fanatical," etc., and have linked us with Cerinthus, Montanus, Anabaptists, etc., it is proper to indicate it as *a fruitful source* of unbelief. For multitudes who cannot be reached by an argument appealing to reason, will permit themselves *to be influenced by invectives.* When, e.g. the author just alluded to, Prof. Garbett says of our doctrine, "few opinions have *in feeble minds,* created more extravagance, or even in our own time taken more unhappy possession of powerful though *unregulated intellects;*"—this is remembered against us while the antidote given by the same writer—when he says of our theory that it "*has always had and now has sober and learned advocates—pious ones it has never wanted; and antiquity it may certainly plead,*" etc.—is forgotten. Whitby's scornful allusions are paraded while his manly admissions of universality, etc., are carefully avoided; Mosheim's uncandid and unhistorical criticisms are carefully presented, while his scholarly testimony to the antiquity and generally received doctrine, and the ability and position of its advocates, is as carefully suppressed. Numerous illustrations of this mode of attack might be given, but the student does not require them, since reason teaches him that the proof of a doctrine does *not exist in the persons* who advocate it, or in the extravagances, error, etc., that may be engrafted upon it. For, if the latter is the criterion, *then* there is no doctrine of the Bible but what might be justly cast aside, seeing how all of them have been allied, in persons entertaining them, with fanaticism, etc.[1] Indeed the wise man will have his suspicions aroused by *the very abuse* heaped upon advocates, seeing that

it savors of a lack of scriptural argument. When the testimony of the Bible can be adduced, no necessity exists for personal defamation. We freely and frankly admit the learning, piety, and eminent ability of our opponents, and by so doing not only perform an act of *simple justice* but elevate *the importance and necessity* of our defending the ancient faith against them. The more honorable our opponents, the more honorable the contest with them. It is to be remarked, however, that in some recent works issued against us there has been a marked change ; our doctrine is treated with respectful attention, and its advocates are spoken of as " *able, pious, learned,*" etc., which must inevitably be the result if the writer is *scholarly and well posted in the history of our doctrine.* For, if the men who have believed as we do are denounced in the way indicated, it *then follows* as a natural sequence, that *the Church itself* can for centuries only be traced through " weak intellects," through " Cerinthian-heresy advocates," and that many of *the brightest ornaments and strongest writers* of the Church are " credulous," " fanatical," etc. The fact is that the charge is too sweeping and endangers the integrity of the Church itself ; and intelligence, seeing this, avoids such a prejudicial mode of procedure. Having already in the brief history of the doctrine shown (Props. 73–79), how incorrectly our doctrine is associated with heresy and fanatical bodies ; leaving the honored names of its advocates to speak for themselves ; having given in detail the arguments upon which we rely in favor of our position ; —we may justly claim that the upholders and defenders of this doctrine have been protected against fanatical and unscriptural views of this Kingdom. The early Church with our faith resisted Cerinthus and others, and this has been a characteristic of its followers to protest against all such views, even if they have incorporated some of the truth concerning it. For, instead of having the word of man, or professed revelations of pretended sanctity and divine guidance to give us proper conceptions of the Kingdom, *we take God's own Word and accept of the declarations concerning it* as contained and repeated on the surface of revelation's stream. This, at once, protects us against mystical, allegorical, hierarchical, spiritualistic, and rationalistic conceptions. We see, in view of its nature, characteristics, and manner of introduction, that it has not been re-established, and this, at once, sets aside *the multitude* of clamorous claims of the past and present. It has not been erected under the Papacy or by Protestants, or sects, or fanatics. Not merely Koller's (Stilling's *Theobald,*) feeble attempt to build the New Jerusalem and act, with his wife, as Vicegerent ; not only the Anabaptist effort in the same direction ; not merely that of the Papacy to build up a splendid, universal Kingdom ; not only that now made to erect a spiritual New Jerusalem with men in it as rulers ; not only all these are rejected as contradictory to the truth, *but every effort,* from whatever source it emanates, to constitute a Kingdom of Jesus Christ *different from the one expressly covenanted to Him.* The attitude thus assumed shields us against giving place to impressions, feelings, spirit communications, human inspiration, etc., bearing upon the subject, so that while not claiming freedom from errors in some things or from the failings of human infirmity, yet with this reliance and trust in a *plainly revealed Kingdom*—this firm foundation of covenant and prophecy in its grammatical sense—we are guilty of far less extravagance, less varied interpretation, etc., than our numerous opponents. Differing in details, we are at least a unit on the subject of the Coming Kingdom at the Sec. Advent,

while our opponents present us differing and antagonistic kingdoms. According to our previously announced principles, such unity, etc. is no evidence, however, of the truthfulness of a doctrine, and it is not presented as such, but only to indicate that if the charge urged against us has *any force* in the eyes of some, it may be applied against themselves. In reference to this Kingdom, against the most plausible speculations and assertions of unbelief, against the profound sophistry of a faithless philosophy, against the epithets bestowed upon us, we can say with those of old : "*It is written,*" and what God causes to be written is true. If the Kingdom is ridiculed, and our "*ignorance and folly*" is deplored, we have at least the great satisfaction of knowing that, "*It is written ;*" that the meaning we contend for is *plainly and unmistakably contained* in the text, while our opponents *infer* theirs at the expense of the first preachers of "the Gospel of the Kingdom." We hold to this Kingdom, because we receive *as an axiomatic truth,* "*the Scriptures cannot be broken*" (John 10 : 35), and implicitly rely upon the saying of the Saviour, "*Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled*" (Matt. 5 : 11). We may indeed be "ignorant and foolish" in many things, but we are not so ignorant and foolish as to set ourselves up *against the grammatical sense of the Bible,* to deny the former existence of the same Kingdom of God, to tear the predictions of the prophets away from their connection with the Jewish nation, and to make out that God's effort to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler will forever prove a failure, and to erect a plan of Redemption which leaves out some of the forfeited blessings and gives us in so far an imperfect Redeemer. The reasons for all this are given in the previous Propositions, and do not need repeating, so that we may conclude by saying, that no truth of importance has ever existed which has not had its opposers. Opposition is to be looked for, and is predicted, as *a constant companion to the truth.* This withstanding, often bitter, is frequently bestowed under *the specious plea* of glorifying God (see e.g. Isa. 66 : 5) and of honoring Christ, but whatever the plea, *the only test* applicable to judge of its real merits is to be found in Holy Writ. Hence it is, that no one should stumble over the varied and contradictory definitions, meanings, and interpretations ascribed to this Kingdom. If the truth exists, its opposite, error, will also be found, and the latter more widely diffused than the former. God tells us this Himself, and warns us distinctively, that such will be especially the state of things, *just previous to the Advent of Christ,* among all the nations of the earth, when, if the prevailing theories are correct, we ought reasonably to expect through development, etc., *the contrary* to occur. Diversity of view must not be mistaken for the opposition we speak of for, as Bickersteth, Bh. Van Mildert, and others, have shown, it is reasonable to expect the former when the great extent of prophecy, the wonderful details, the conciseness of statements, etc., are taken into consideration ; and our remarks do not include a fair hearing and examination of the opinions of others under the influence of justice and love for the truth, but are directed against that *distortion* of facts, *misrepresentation* of statements, ascription of *unworthy* motives and *personal* attacks, which characterize so many productions of the day. Every writer should feel willing and desirous that his work should be subjected to rigid examination and criticism, but only in the spirit inculcated by the Divine Master, and in the light of the Holy Scriptures. The doctrine of the Kingdom, so essential and lead-

ing, should not be obscured or rejected, because of the errors in interpretation, prophecy, covenant, etc., by others ; and such errors should not be joyfully held up as evidence of their being no truth in the system upheld, but true wisdom and scholarship suggest that the truth by due examination and comparison with Scripture be separated from error. Infallibility does not belong to man, and hence the best of men—as if to encourage us in our own efforts—give us evidences of weakness and imperfection in some things. Fortunately for us, our destiny is in God's hands, and as *He is more merciful and pitiful* than man, we can rely upon Him in our labors, imperfect as they are, provided they are the result of a sincere search after, and desire for, the truth, and are not merely the production of personal feeling, contention, etc. This does not forbid the use of plain and decided language in reference either to the statements made by others, or the doctrines promulgated, or the tendencies that they may have (no author can object to this if correctly given) with the proof attached drawn from Scripture, and the facts of history. Therefore it is, that the mode of controversy, so long maintained against our doctrine and its advocates, is to be deprecated as not only unjust, but wrongfully calculated to prejudice the multitude against us without a hearing. It is in a great measure due to this feature that so many are unwilling *even to examine* the subject, and see what foundation it has in the Scriptures, and through it largely the professing Church has lost faith in the Kingdom, once the hope and joy of the pious Jew and devout early Christian.[2]

[1] Thomas Harley said : " Among the many arts practised in order to bring any truth into discredit, none is more popular than that of exhibiting it to public view joined with the absurd tenets of some that have espoused it, and which is not improperly called dressing up truth *in a fool's coat* on purpose to make it ridiculous ; and this often succeeds with *the undiscerning vulgar*, who judge only from the outward appearance of things." Dr. Seiss, who quotes Harley, justly adds (p. 338 *Last Times*) : " It is this art which has been practised for the most part by the enemies of Millenarian doctrine, and that, too, with a goodly degree of success. It is to be hoped that the time is at hand when men will deal with the subject with some degree of that candor which it really deserves." Such candor is manifested by a few learned opponents, but we cannot, judging human nature from the past, expect it *to be largely adopted*. For so bitter and unrelenting is the feeling against us in some quarters that every advantage, however illogical and unworthy, is taken against us. Such are even more autocratic in their reception of us than Louis XIV. was in his court. The spirit of Dr. Schellwig (*Quart. Review*, Ap., 1874), a Professor in Rostock, discussing the question whether Spener was saved and deciding negatively, is still transmitted (as well as that of the Faculty of Wittenberg in 1695 publishing a tract in which Spener was charged with two hundred and eighty-three errors) and as lynx-eyed. May we add that the false statements made respecting others reminds one of the " Death-Blow to Corrupt Doctrines," published by the Chinese, and noticed in the *Dublin Univ. Mag.* for 1872, and republished in Littell's *Liv. Age*, under the title, " A Looking-Glass for Christians."

[2] It may be properly added : to judge another, who may not believe in all things as we do, and pronounce him to be no Christian (although cleaving to Christ and bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit) is evidence of a narrow, contracted mind and an illiberal heart, and is a virtual disobedience of divine injunctions and rebukes on the subject. It places the individual or sect or party in the position to which Paul's language justly applies, Rom. 14 : 4 ; 1 Cor. 13 : 1-13, etc. It savors of the spirit of the disciples when they wished to call down fire, and is the reverse of that apostolic mind which rejoiced, even if the whole truth was not proclaimed, that Jesus was preached. Enlightened piety is willing to " forbear with our brethren in love." We do not overlook the sad fact stated by *Guesses at Truth* (p. 492) : " One of the saddest things about human nature is that a man may guide others in the path of life, without walking in it himself ; that he may be a pilot, and yet a castaway." Men, like Brown, Waldegrave, etc., may endeavor to overthrow our position, while neglecting to establish their own or refusing to notice our proofs, but this very omission is indicative of an eagerness to find fault with us. As

Mencius says : "The disease of men is this : that they neglect their own fields and go to weed the fields of others, and that what they require from others is great, while what they lay upon themselves is light."

Obs. 9. Not content with the motives presented to cause disbelief in our doctrine, it is remarkable (owing to its contradictory nature) that a prevailing one urged by the most respectable writers (e.g. Rev. David Brown in *Christ's Sec. Coming*, etc., Steele's *Essay on Christ's Kingdom*), handed down from one to the other (and evidently adopted without examination), and found in nearly every one of their books is the following : viz.—that such a belief in the Kingdom, and of necessity in the Pre-Mill. Advent of King Jesus, paralyzes efforts for the salvation of others, *and is an obstacle to missionary labor.* Those who make the objection forget the activity and missionary labors of the early Church so extensively Millenarian in view ; they overlook the large number of missionaries and friends of missions who have been and are Millenarians ;[1] they pass by and condemn some of the noblest men in their respective denominations (Episcopalian, Lutheran, Reformed, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, etc.), who have been Millenarians, and yet noted for abundant Christian work ; they ignore the numerous practical writings, the preaching, the success, the founding of missionary organizations, etc., by Millenarians, and *are utterly unable to designate a single writer of them who has ever expressed a word against missionary effort.* Indeed the doctrine we hold cannot, in the nature of the case, produce the effect thus confidently proclaimed. Let them show *how* it can paralyze activity and zeal, *when* its entire tenor and scope is to present us with motives to increased earnestness, etc., in behalf of the truth. Let them prove that a servant who watches for the speedy return of his master *is more likely* to prove unfaithful and inactive than he who believes that the master will not return for a long time. Is the proclamation of the truth *hostile* to the Kingdom or the Advent? Do the Scriptures urge diligence, piety, etc., grounded on the fact that the Lord *may come* at any time? Do those who unreflectingly persist in loading our faith with such an accusation, even think that by so doing they are virtually sitting in judgment over and condemning *the motives* that the Spirit has given? How can this even be reconciled with the frank *concessions* in our behalf made by opposers in sympathy with themselves, as e.g. Waldegrave (*Lec. on N. T. Millenarianism*, p. 6) tells us "that the advocates of the Pre-Millennial Advent *are found, as they most certainly are, among the best men of our day, and the most faithful sons of the Church.*" Desprez (*John, or the Apocalypse*), while totally rejecting our doctrine, still frankly admits that "*it was the impelling power of the first missionaries, which won all the grand victories of early Christianity*" (see *Proph. Times*, p. 172, Nov. 1870).[2] In "An Appeal to the Churches," issued in 1867, from Boston, subscribed by sixty clergymen with Albert Barnes at the head of the list, reference is made to the first three centuries as a model for revival and missionary exertions—the very Church so diffused with the Millenarian leaven. This obviously intended objection may well be dismissed with the remark, that a proper understanding of this Kingdom, the manner of its introduction, the gracious purposes involved in its postponement, the fearful displays of wrath and the wonderful exhibitions of faithfulness and mercy accompanying it, etc., are amply sufficient to subdue the heart of the believer into a glad willingness to occupy the posture of *a waiting,*

watching and laboring servant, who feels the importance of redeeming the time and working while it is day—who desires to hasten the restitution by gathering the people required—who knowing the night, is not discouraged by a lack of success, but testifies to secure God's approval.

[1] See David N. Lord's *Theol. and Lit. Journal* for July, 1850, art. 1, where he at length rebuts this charge, giving the proofs as derived from various denominations, showing that very many missionaries are Millenarians, that their warmest supporters are such that both domestic and foreign missions are upheld by them, etc. So also Brookes, Bickersteth, McNeile, Cox and others. Recently in the *Proph. Times*, Feb., 1875, p. 36, the editor, Rev. Wilson, referring to the matter, shows that a large proportion of missionaries in the foreign field—as stated to him by missionaries themselves—are believers in our doctrine. And reveals the fact that some were forbidden by the officers of the societies to express their views in this country "for fear of discouraging our people." And in reference to the large number, he adds: "This we were told two years ago by a prominent missionary, who held this view (i.e. our doctrine) and lamented to us that he was compelled to be so tongue-tied (i.e. in missionary addresses) in the enunciation of it in this country." Some missionaries, as Wolf and others, have written their views on the subject. (Comp. Prop. on His. of Doctrine.)

[2] It is a matter of reflection how in the biographies of eminent men the writers have taken leave to strike out all allusions to their faith in our doctrine or give it a bare mention. Various examples can be given, but a recent one will suffice. Dr. Wayland in his account of Müller's labors in *Life of Trust* has, "in a great measure suppressed or ignored the fact that the apostolic faith and labors of this faithful servant of God, according to his own testimony, was mainly upheld and cheered by the blessed hope of the literal Coming and Kingdom of the Lord." (See a writer, E. M., in *Proph. Times*, art. 1, Nov., 1867.) So e.g. in various Lives of John Wesley, his sentiments on the subject are quietly ignored, as a recent biographer (Tyerman; see Prop. 78) noticed and rebuked.

Obs. 10. In giving the causes which produce in the Church such want of faith in the Kingdom, prominently may be noticed *the Whitbyan hypothesis*" of the conversion of the world by the Church, through which it is hoped this Church Kingdom will finally assume the proportions and attain to the characteristics of the Kingdom as predicted. Even a Bampton Lecturer, and others, under a vivid imagination, *can apply Isa.* 60, *as already "magnificently" verified* in the history of a struggling persecuted church. Having already (Prop. 175) briefly examined this theory, it may be well to suggest, that before it is made into an argument against us, it would be well first to establish its *scriptural foundation*, and show *how it can be reconciled* with the expectations and hopes of the apostles and Primitive Church. Yet many, assuming it to be true, ground their entire opposition against us upon its truth. The Roman Catholic idea, indorsed by some Protestants, viz., that Christ's Kingdom is in the third heaven, that saints are transported to it, that it ever will remain there, and that a branch of that Kingdom under a Vicegerent or Hierarchical rule exists here on the earth for a time—is so flatly contradicted by our doctrine, and by the postponement of the Kingdom, and is so condemnatory of the powers and rule claimed, that it is no wonder the doctrine is *so bitterly* opposed by them. It is utterly impossible for a Millenarian to become a follower of a Church which assumes in its head the titles and prerogatives of a King over the Church, and it is equally impossible for that Church, as Chillingworth long ago pointed out, *to reconcile its belief* with the Millenarian faith of the Primitive Church. The Swedenborgian notion that the New Jerusalem state is already introduced and is destined to spread over the earth; in brief, all the various theories running down to Shakerism, Mormonism, etc., have by their distinctive teachings of the Kingdom *as now existing* in some form, visible or

invisible, outward or inward, a decided authority and influence in the minds of many to cause them to turn a deaf ear to the scriptural delineations of the Kingdom. No matter *what* the covenants say, *what* the prophets describe, *what* the disciples preached, *what* the early Church believed, these live in *a new era* of enlightenment, and have nothing to do with "*the old paths.*" Without seeing how all this saps the foundations of the Scriptures, making them unreliable and untrustworthy, they tell us to accept of their mode of interpreting the Bible, and then we shall see as they themselves perceive. Others, not caring how it will fare with God's Word, boldly declare that a man now with the accumulation of the past, *knows more* of doctrinal truth than the apostles. To preserve the sinking credit of the Papacy, *infallibility* is proclaimed to sustain the faithful in their belief in the Kingdom governed by the Pontiff. Many, who can ridicule this claim in Popery, are no better when they claim *an infallible guide* in some Confession, prophet, teacher, in short, anything outside of the Bible. The reflection follows: when we behold all those theories and systems of faith—all hostile to our doctrine—with numerous, learned, powerful, adherents, and these actuated by party attachments and associated inclinations and regard, it seems impracticable to hope *for any large additions* to our number. Indeed, taking Holy Writ for our guide, we dare not anticipate it, for if there were a revulsion in the Church making our doctrine *as popular* as it once was in the early Church, *then* the Bible would lose one of its landmarks of prophecy and prove untrue to itself. All that we can reasonably expect is, that, as God will not leave His truth *without witnesses, a few*, here and there in all denominations as now, will test their theories by the plain grammatical sense of the Word, as advocated by us; and under its guidance return to the blessed faith and hope characteristic of the Church in apostolic times. But in the utmost candor and with due respect to our opposers, may it be suggested, that, in all probability, the secret reason for rejecting faith in our doctrine lies with some *in dislike to the humbling features* of the doctrine, viz., that it utterly discards all human schemes and plans for "the regeneration" of society and the world. This Kingdom that we teach, being God's own Theocratic arrangement for the government of the world, *repudiates all human organizations;* it will completely set them aside and put in place of them *the Theocracy* under Jesus Christ and His associated Ruler. This takes such a low estimate of things that men prize so highly; this abases what so many now pride themselves in; this so degrades the boasted advancement and development of the race; this so debases the pet theories, hierarchical tendencies, claims of superiority, etc., advanced by multitudes—that it is *too humiliating* to their own dignity and the loftiness of humanity to accept of it. A doctrine which threatens the perpetuity of institutions, organizations, etc.—which teaches that they are all imperfect, and must give place to a divine revelation of the Theocracy, *is far from being acceptable* to powerful bodies, to partisan adherents, to wealthy corporations, to laborers for the conversion of the world, to ecclesiastical rulers, etc. The Kingdom requires a radical change, resurrection and glorification in its inheritors, a complete conversion and revolution of faith and practice in the Jewish nation, and an entire submission and consecration of the Gentiles to its dominion. Its rulership, its Theocratic guidance, its fountain head of authority and power, is committed to a body of resurrected and glorified ones, Jesus being the Chief, and its very nature, design, accomplishment

being for the Redemption of the race, all mere human systems, whatever their merit for the present dispensation, must give place to the new ordering, the renewed Theocracy. Men, instead of studying and appreciating God's plan for "regeneration" and "restitution," hug their own delusive plans and existing forms for the salvation of the race and world. Overlooking the sign of the present dispensation, which is not to convert the world, but to gather out them that believe to form the irresistible body of rulers in the Coming Theocracy, men *engraft upon it their own faith and hopes and correspondingly act.* If there is a truth distinctly taught in connection with this Kingdom, it certainly is, that all existing forms of polity, government, etc., shall give place to the new ordering when Messiah's Kingdom is set up as *covenanted and predicted.* Hence, this doctrine instructs us to think less of the present world and more of "the world to come"—less of existing organizations and more of the mighty, all-prevailing One to come. This doctrine condemns man; finds fault with his projects for reforming humanity; makes him entirely dependent for the amelioration of the race on God and His Coming Son; tells him that his lofty fabrics shall be overthrown, that his expected reformation shall be a failure, that his anticipated prosperity shall end in ruin, that his alliance with the world in hope of gain and ascendency shall be met by a destruction; and *therefore it is,* that this doctrine *is so hated* by many, *so abused* by others, and regarded *with unfriendly hearts* by the mass. It is *a protest* against human nature in man, society, ecclesiastical systems, Church and State—that depravity exists in them all, and that, whatever good each and all may subserve under the present order, they are not fitted for "the Kingdom of Heaven" without radical and sweeping alterations (beyond human ability to effect) which shall fit them for the happy Theocratic ordering. There is no hope in humanity developing itself by its projects, allied as it may be to systems which contain more or less good, and this is proven *by the position it occupies just previous to, and at, the Second Advent as delineated by the Spirit.*

Obs. 11. This lack of faith in this Kingdom is *the more inexcusable* since it is not only protested against in the plain grammatical sense of the Word, but God has raised up men, in all denominations, to direct special attention to it. It is true that in many instances in the past some have fared very much as Jeremiah (20 : 10), yet like the prophet, urged by the commands of the Saviour, the importance of the subject, and the welfare of others, they continued to testify. In strict analogy with the past dealings of God, *it is reasonable to expect,* that, as the time approaches for the times of the Gentiles to end, and for the setting up of this Kingdom, *the simple early Church view should be revived.* It is *with gratitude* that we notice some of the most profound scholars and theologians of Europe and this country indorse the Primitive Church doctrine, while others are veering more and more in that direction. It is significant (in reference to the latter) e.g. that Van Oosterzee seizes upon the doctrine of the Kingdom as *the basis* of theology, embracing the Divine Purpose, and accords, in his way, a Pre-Mill. Advent of Jesus Christ, etc. It is expressive, that some of our recent opponents, forced to it by prophecy (as e.g. Fairbairn, etc.) leave the former line of argument, and frankly admit that the Kingdom as represented in Millennial descriptions can never be realized without a special Divine interference and manifestation of Supernatural

power, etc. Taking our leading commentaries (as e.g. Lange, Alford, Bengel, Crit. Eng. Test., etc.)—expositions of portions of the Scripture (as e.g. Elliot, Lord, Ryle, etc.)—sermons on the subject (as e.g. McNeile's, Cumming, Cox, etc.); books written in defence (as e.g. Bickersteth, Shimmeall, Birks, Brookes, etc.); periodicals published in behalf of the doctrine (as e.g. Bonar's, Leask's, Seiss's, etc.) besides a large number of publications[1] giving no uncertain evidence, it is certain *that sufficient testimony* has been given to arouse an unwilling Church and world to consider this doctrine. This very testimony fills a landmark of prophecy, fulfilling the cry, "*Behold the Bridegroom Cometh,*" reiterating the apostolic warning, "*the Coming of the Lord draweth nigh,*" and holding forth the last communication of Jesus: "*Behold I come as a thief,*" "*Surely I come quickly,*" etc. If it were wanting, *a link* in the chain of evidence would also be missing. Being present—however it may have been used by some for mere sensationalism or excitement—and held by witnesses of probity and learning, who find it *authoritatively* in the Scriptures, and give *the reason* for the faith that is in them based upon Holy Writ it—thus accurately corresponding with the waiting, longing position of the Primitive Church, with the apostolic cautions, and with the admonitions of the Master Himself—commends itself to the reason and heart of, alas, *the comparatively few. When* Whitby enumerates the noble list of Fathers in the Eastern and Western Church who held and taught our doctrine; *when* Albert Barnes (*Com. Rev.* p. 467) tells us that "the opinion (i.e. Millenarianism) here adverted to was held substantially by Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, among the Christian Fathers, and, it need not be said, is held by many modern expositors of the Bible, and by large numbers of Christian ministers of high standing, and other Christians;" *when* various opponents pronounce it even, "a splendid, magnificent phantom" (the very reproach forcing an indirect admission of its desirableness, adaptedness, completeness, etc.)—*it is proof* that the attention of the Church has been duly called to it, and that *the responsibility* of its rejection does not cling to the skirts of its advocates. There is not an objection or argument urged against it, that has not been duly met by an appeal to the Word; and there is scarcely a proof text in the Bible that has not, in some form, been presented in its behalf, always appealing to the grammatical sense. Notwithstanding this, it is a sad fact, that too many in the Church have measured the ways of God as exhibited in our doctrine by *the same standard employed by infidels.* The latter tells us that the test applied to Abraham in the proposed sacrifice of Isaac was *unworthy* of God, that the Incarnation is *derogatory* to the Deity, that the Mosaic law was *degrading*, etc., and *precisely*—after all our appeals to its being literally expressed in the Scriptures and to its having been believed in under apostolic teaching—*the same rule* is applied to this Kingdom—reiterated in many works as the culminating objection—and it is rejected as unworthy of God. Reason sits in judgment over the reasoning, the testimony assigned, and thus far correctly, but when she assumes to measure the fitness, the worthiness of God's plans, *she transcends her mission.* If it can be shown that the plan is unreasonable in its adaptation to secure the result aimed at, *then*, of course, a logical argument is raised against us to which we must yield. The objection must not cover *God's ability to perform what He has promised.* Let us ask, where is the opponent of our doctrine who has ever vindicated the charge thus urged against us *by show-*

ing that the Theocratic Kingdom thus restored under the Messiah and risen saints is not adapted to secure the Redemption of the race, etc.? If honest to themselves and to us, they must admit that there is not a feature distinctively relating to this Kingdom, but what if carried out as our doctrine portrays, will result in producing the blessing predicted. If so—*and this is unquestionable*—why then urge an excuse for unbelief which necessarily reflects upon the character and ability of God, and sets man over Him as the judge of the worthiness of His Divine Purposes? True reason, allied with faith, cannot present it, without doing violence to the abundant testimony given ; and hence the root of it must be found in things previously mentioned and to a desire to crush, if possible, the doctrine by loading it with corruption. As an indication of this spirit, it is only necessary to recall what we find gravely presented by many writers in view of our doctrine being so largely allied with prophecy, viz. that prophecy cannot be understood *until after* the fulfilment, etc. The insincerity of this pretext for unbelief is abundantly witnessed in *their professed ability,* over against us, to comprehend these same predictions, apply them to their own Church-Kingdom and to their notions respecting the future. Prophecy has no difficulties and can be readily comprehended *when* related to their own theories, but just so soon as we insist upon the grammatical sense being retained and their connection with the Jewish nation, and the overthrown Theocracy being observed, *then,* owing to the apparent antagonism which this gives to their doctrines, prophecy is fearfully obscure. Does not this evince *that disposition* has more to do with the matter *than reason.* The Jews, because they did not deal faithfully with prophecy, were pronounced by Jesus Himself guilty of hypocrisy, and how narrowly some escape the same censure is evidenced by *the manner* in which they employ it. Surely it is no small matter to have the prophets, all testifying to this Kingdom, in our hands ; and God justly holds us *accountable* for the manner in which we receive and understand them. This He does, not because of the *mystical, spiritual, rationalistic* senses which must be learned in the writings of men, but, because the unequivocal sense brought out by the generally received laws of language, is *the one accessible to all.* We are not required to wade through the volumes of the Schoolmen, the folios of Swedenborg, etc., to find out the meaning of the prophets, the Word—*it is found upon its very surface.* Therefore it is, that notwithstanding the plain predictions of unbelief in this Kingdom, its mode of re-establishment by the personal Advent, etc., the Kingdom itself (caused either by a neglect or perversion of the prophecies and the testimony given) will be preceded by *a general incredulity for which God will hold men strictly responsible,* as evidenced by the outgoings of His wrath at that period. It is in view of this (aside from the personal honor and happiness, the special promises to, and blessings bestowed upon believers) that we should give this testimony due and most candid examination, without allowing the reproaches or theories of men to affect our judgment, lest, peradventure, we find ourselves *answerable for a faith* which God will not recognize as a proper one. In such an investigation every step should be founded upon Scripture, not upon isolated passages from which inferences can be wrongfully drawn, but upon *the general connection* as found in covenant, history, prophecy, preaching, fulfilment, etc., lest in making our deductions we be found to be "*wise in our own eyes and prudent in our own sight.*" The question to be decided, is not what the Bible *may mean,* what it *ought to mean,* what this or

that church *says it means*, but *what it really and honestly means;* and this of course again involves the principle of interpretation *as fundamental* which is the basis of our doctrine, otherwise the Book may assume *any* shape, *any* meaning at the pleasure of the Interpreter. The inspiration (not of a recondite but) of the plain sense of the Bible is with us an established fact (proven by the Divine Unity, etc.) and upon it we advance, in confirmation of our doctrinal position, chapter and verse, confidently relying upon what it teaches. That a sense, not contained in the express language (as e.g. converting David's throne into the Father's in the third heaven, etc.) is inspired, must first be proven. Warned that men will reject the truth, will not endure sound doctrine, will turn to fables etc., *we are gratified with our position*, which accords with the charge made by Paul to Timothy (2 Tim. 4 : 1–5, see entire connection) that he should be faithful to the Word because of Christ's "*appearing and Kingdom*," when He comes to judge "the quick and the dead." Thus cautioned, we cling the closer to "*His appearing and Kingdom*," and proclaim the Word in its light, persistently refusing all that may interfere with this relationship. This "appearing" and the Kingdom following, as Dr. Auberlen justly remarks, "*does not rest upon isolated passages, but is essential to a right understanding of the entire body of the Old Test., and is the fundamental idea of the New, in which the sum and substance of Messianic Prophecy is concentrated.*" It may be that such a course may result in others calling us "alarmists," "croakers" (although none are more cheerful and hopeful in faith than such believers) because of the attitude of protest against the worldly spirit, of warning against unbelief and its sure tendency, of entreaty against the danger incurred, of great hope only in Christ's Coming, etc., but we are satisfied if it secures from the Saviour *the approval and blessing of the watching servant* (e.g. Luke 12 : 37–49, etc.), the designation of "*a good minister of Jesus Christ*" (1 Tim. 4 : 6, context), the removal of *unfaithfulness* (Ezek. 33 : 6, etc.), the bestowal of *blamelessness* (1 Cor. 1 : 5–8), etc.

[1] See Elliott's *Apoc.*, Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, Brookes's *El. Proph. Interpretation*, Bickersteth's *Guide*, Seiss's *Last Times*, App., Shimeall's *Reply to Prof. Shedd*, etc., for long lists of eminent names in the Church, European, American, etc. Compare also our own extended and detailed list given under Prop. 78 and preceding ones.

Obs. 12. While it is unnecessary to exhibit in detail the declining of faith — so triumphantly paraded by one party, so sadly lamented by another, so weakly denied against existing facts by still another class—it may be in place to illustrate out of the abundant material, by a recent and striking case, *the practical workings* of unbelief. Let us take, for example, a work (already alluded to, being highly indorsed) *John, or the Apocalypse of the New Testament*, by Rev. Desprez. This is a singular book, owing to its copious *concessions* to our doctrine up to a certain point, and *then* to its sudden turning to unbelief, casting itself into the embraces of a destructive criticism. The honesty and candor of the writer is conspicuously displayed in numerous statements, and affords in consequence painful evidence, in its contrasts, of the influence of no faith in Divine utterances. The author fully sustains our position, and proclaims it incontrovertible, that our doctrine *is fully and explicitly taught* in the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse; that it was held by "*the first two or three centuries*," that it is so interwoven in the New Test. and so incorporated

with motives to obedience, salvation, etc., with every form of Christian expectation, hope, doctrine, etc., *that it cannot be denied* by lawful interpretation, exegesis, reasoning, and attention to facts. Although *hostile* to our views, he fully, freely, unreservedly admits that they exist in the Word *just as we claim, and that we cannot be confuted from the standpoint of Scripture or history.* He takes precisely the same view of the early preaching of "the Gospel of the Kingdom" that we advocate in this work, and asserts it to be *impregnable,* etc. Finding our doctrine so firmly fixed in the grammatical sense of the Word and in the history of these times; ascertaining by examination and comparison that it cannot be logically and consistently eradicated, *being part of the Bible itself,* he coolly, most deliberately proposes, in the spirit of the Tübingen school, *to cut out of the Scriptures all that pertains to this doctrine,* on the ground, that such a Kingdom never was realized as preached and believed in, and *hence cannot possibly be true.* Even words put into the mouth of Jesus (as e.g. Matt. 24; Mark 13; Luke 21, etc.) must be discarded or else, because the events spoken of did not soon after take place, Jesus is convicted of error. What a destructive theory! Suppose all the allusions, references, direct teachings, etc., upon the subject are removed (being incorporated with and permeating the New Test. as he admits) *what* is left of the New Test., and *what* becomes of the authenticity, credibility, and inspiration of the Apostles? Does not the whole Bible then become what he pronounces, from his sweeping procedure, the Apocalypse to be "*a grand chimera of the approaching Kingdom of God*"—"*the offshoots of a pious yet wayward imagination, the creations of a loving, trustful, yet fevered and heated brain*"? The New is based upon the Old Testament, and this criticism sweeps away *the Covenant that God swore* should be fulfilled; blasts like a simoon *the inspiration* of prophets; convicts the apostles, or at least the writers, of gross error, weakness, and imposition, and naturally leads (because this and that is not true) to a rejection of the whole. *What reliance* can be placed in a Book, which then (according to this author) contains such *palpable falsehoods,* which misguided multitudes by shameful fabrications, and which is crowded from beginning to end with fiction and untruth. This distructive work, this effort to get rid of our doctrine is not the performance of Strauss, Bauer and Renan, but of a clergyman of the Church of England, indorsed by high names in England and this country. It is simply the judgment of this writer that our doctrine is a mistake; and as *it cannot be logically taken out of the Bible,* every portion containing it must be rejected as unworthy of credence. But let us remind him, his indorsers and readers, that our doctrine has other evidences besides those which he produces. These are stubborn facts *which cannot be set aside, and which prove* that the writers of the New Testament knew of the things which they affirmed. Look at this *covenanted* Kingdom as it *once existed,* as it *was overthrown,* and *then notice* how the prophecies embrace that which was and is *a reality.* Trace the historical connection and behold the fulfilment. *Then notice,* what Desprez takes *wrongfully* for granted, that Jesus and none of the Apostles teach that the Kingdom shall *be immediately set up,* but that they unite in locating it indefinitely *in the future at the Sec. Advent.* Especially observe, that the first preaching of the Kingdom was conditioned by the repentance of the Jews, and that Scripture and history attest that the nation did not repent, and that as a result of non-repentance the Kingdom was expressly withdrawn and

postponed during a period called "the times of the Gentiles." The duration of this era is dependent upon the gathering out of an elect people, while the evidence of such postponement is found in the express language of Jesus (see for proof Props. 58, 66, 67, 68, etc.) *conveniently overlooked* by the author, in the terrible fall and continued scattered (yet preserved) state of the Jewish nation, in the Gentiles treading down Jerusalem, in the establishment of the Church and the gathering out of a people. Such *evidences* accumulated for many centuries, the positive outgrowth of the postponed Theocratic Plan, and yet in some respects preparatory to its accomplishment, *must have their due weight* in deciding upon the credibility, etc., of the writers of the Bible, and yet in the entire argument this author *most carefully avoids* them, just as if they had no existence. Surely before judging in so important a matter, prudence, if not wisdom, ought to suggest the reception of *the entire testimony*, without the suppression of *the leading, essential part* which gives *the key* to the understanding of the remarkable change in the offer of this Kingdom, and of the reason why it was not established. While the book cannot injure a believer in the doctrine, yet it will fall into the hands of others who cannot detect *the fallacy* underlying its argumentation. Yea, more, forming an opinion from a comparison of prophecies relating to the last times, it seems more than probable, that the method by which multitudes will refuse faith in the Coming Kingdom, is indicated in the manner and style employed by the author, involving a denial of "*the blessed hope*," the inheritance of David's Son, and the faith and hope of apostles, martyrs, confessors, and others.

One of the editors of the *Proph. Times*, Nov., 1870, in a just criticism of this work, aptly remarks in the language of another: "It is a rule with me, the more I hear people deny the Coming of Christ, the day of judgment, and the conflagration, with other things of the like nature, the more to hold on to them, for their denial is to me one of the highest proofs of the certainty of those events." There is profound wisdom in this remark, for such denial is predicted and, as God's Word is truth and every "jot and tittle" shall be fulfilled, it is the *most reasonable thing* in the world to expect, as confirmatory both of inspiration and our faith, just such works as Desprez's, and just such efforts as the Tübingen school puts forth, and just such opposition to our doctrine as the Church and world presents. A general unbelief, involving a denial of the Advent and Kingdom, is most certainly predicted; certainly then the state of Christendom rapidly drifting through such labors into such a state, should strengthen, and not weaken our faith in the Word, which thus proves its own inspiration in describing these teachers of unbelief and their success. Simple faith in what God says is the best protection against all such efforts, and in this fortunately unlearned are as well protected as the most learned.

Obs. 13. Will our opponents receive in all kindness some suggestions of *the mode of argumentation* that is required to fairly meet our doctrinal position. We desire light; and if we point out what difficulties are to be explained, and what objections are to be removed, it may enable some one to deal with the subject in a way that will at least commend itself to us as *a sincere and honest* method of answering us. The works issued against us thus far, *will never influence a single believer* in our doctrine (however much they may establish unbelievers) for the reason that in many cases they do not answer the objections urged against them by us in the interpretation of Scripture, but chiefly confine themselves to their own interpretation, and *then* take it *for granted* that we are answered. We on the other hand, give fearlessly our own and theirs, and *compare* them. Take e.g. the struggle over Rev. 20 : 4, 5, 6,—now in every exposition of theirs we are

told that "*souls*" cannot possibly mean persons, etc., and no notice is taken of *the proof to the contrary* alleged by us. Indeed their exegetical comments are given on the passage without *venturing to contrast* ours alongside of it, for fear of exposing their own weakness. On the other hand our leading expositions boldly contrast the two, and show by *the very contrast* which is most worthy of credence. This line of thought was suggested by the fact too, that all the recent works contain without exception the same formula of proof without *the least effort* to show in what respect our interpretation of Scripture is defective, saving only that it does not correspond with their own. It was reasonably expected that such a writer as Dr. Hodge, especially in view of the opinions of prominent men in his own denomination, would meet the questions at issue in his Sys. Theology in a new and interesting manner, but to the surprise and disappointment of not a few, he gives but a reproduction (unworthy of his ability) of Dr. Brown's *Christ's Sec. Coming*, and Barnes's *Revelation*. Let it be understood by all that the old and oft-repeated statement (harmless to us, but perhaps weighty to the ignorant) that Rev. 20 contains *the foundation* (some say the only recital) of our doctrine must be proven or recalled. Mere assertion—in the face of the early Church, and all believers since, appealing to the covenants and prophecies, to the gospels and epistles as containing the doctrine—cannot produce conviction ; the mere distinctive mention of the one thousand years (measuring the interval between the two resurrections and the binding of Satan) or of the resurrection and reigning of the saints (for these are contained in other Scriptures) does not make it such. Our appeal, with Barnabas and all other Millenarians, for our *foundation is in the covenanted Theocratic Kingdom*. To show that we are *fundamentally* incorrect, to get at *the root* of our doctrine, let them go to the Davidic Covenant and prove that *the grammatical sense of that covenant is not meant ;* that another meaning is to be engrafted upon it ; that they have an express authoritative Scripture for making such an alteration ; and that a covenant *sworn* to be fulfilled can be ignored or explained away. Let our opponents, in this connection, proceed to indicate *how* we are wrong in cleaving to the grammatical sense of the Bible in doctrine ; and, if wrong, let them produce *the unvarying rules* of a spiritual or Origenistic interpretation *to be a guide* to us so as not to leave us at the pleasure of the expositor. The common resort, when we bring forward the grammatical sense, is to pronounce it wrong, then to assert that it may have another meaning, and adopt the latter without first showing that it is the true meaning, *the very thing at issue*. If the spiritual interpretation is safe and reliable, *then* it certainly ought to have fixed, definite rules, accessible to all, by which we can be governed and protected from error. *Where are they, and who will lay them down?* Our rules can be found in every grammar and rhetoric, and are common to all languages. In addition, let such inform us *why* the covenant does *not yet specially pertain* to the Jewish nation ; *why* it is not still the elect nation owing to its Theocratic relationship, and *why* the prophecies, which declare that the fallen, ruined, scattered but still preserved nation shall ultimately be restored to its lofty Theocratic position with the Gentiles engrafted, shall not be fulfilled. Let them inform us *by what process* they can logically apply predictions given exclusively (as the fulfilment of the curses evince) to the Jews—and which declare that the identical people, land, and capital afflicted, oppressed, and downtrodden, shall

be restored again under Messiah's reign in the re-established throne and Kingdom of David—to the Gentiles in their Church relationship. Will they point out by *what authority* they divide Millennial descriptions of this Kingdom, and refuse credence to a literal resurrection joined with them when Paul expressly quotes them and locates the resurrection of the saints at that period, as e.g. 1 Cor. 15 : 54? Will they tell us *why* the most of them admit two literal resurrections under the last trumpet (as in 1 Cor. 15 and Rev. 11 : 18), and refuse to believe in the portrayal of another (Rev. 20 : 4, 5, 6) under the same trumpet; and *why* the same word used in the last passage named, to denote the corporeal resurrection of Jesus is not adapted to mean that of His followers in the same sense? Will they attempt *to reconcile,* without degrading them, the preaching of John the Baptist, of the disciples, of the early Church, with their theory of the Kingdom? It would afford us great pleasure to see it tried without involving them, although specially sent forth and supported, in error. Can they explain Acts 1 : 6 *consistently* with the previous preaching of the Kingdom, and with the subsequent faith of the churches under the preaching of the same apostles. Will they inform us *how it was possible* for inspired men to believe in the Kingdom as now upheld, when their constant expressed hope was in the Advent of Jesus Christ and His Kingdom, for which they exhorted all believers to look, pray, and watch. Instead of simply clinging to the Popish view of the judgment and judgment day and insist from it that they are right, will they follow our scriptural proof as to the meaning and representations of these, and *show* that we are wrong, and *wherein* our argument is defective? This is the more important since Brown, Barnes, Hodge, etc., reiterate the old objection without *the least attempt* to prove that their interpretation is correct, or that ours is erroneous. To test the matter between us, will they inform us whether our application of the fire in Matt. 25 : 41, to the lake of fire in Rev. 19 : 20 (comp. after Millennial era, Rev. 20 : 10) is incorrect, and if so, *why erroneous?* (Here is suggested the cause of just complaint upon our side, viz., that reasons assigned why certain passages—test ones between us as the one now indicated—are to be understood in a certain sense and assigned to a certain period of time, are *entirely ignored,* and the passages triumphantly claimed, *as if such reasons were never repeatedly presented and urged.* On the other hand, no reason has been given by them, but what has also been duly considered by Millenarians. While some of us may have been more or less guilty of the same procedure, yet, as a perusal of our leading works on our side abundantly evidence, *the rule* is to acknowledge and reply to all the reasons given by our opponents either in general or in particulars. Feeling the solidity and importance of our doctrine, we are only too anxious to meet, for the sake of inquirers and others, the proof given for interpretation and application of texts, etc. Common justice in argumentation, aside from other considerations, demands this, and it is to be hoped that it may be more practised.) Will they tell us *what Coming* of the Lord and saints is denoted in Zech. 14 : 5, and *how* this Coming can be reconciled with the remainder of the chapter; *what Coming* is meant in 2 Thess. 2 : 8, and *how* this Advent and the context can be made to correspond with a previous Millennial period; *how* the Coming of the Sun of Righteousness, the utter destruction of the wicked, and the exaltation of the righteous in Mal. 4 : 1–3 can be reconciled with their interpretation of numerous passages,

as e.g. the parable of the tares and wheat; *how* the Advent of the Lord in Hab. 3 can be transformed into a Coming of God to deliver the Israelites out of Egypt, etc., *when* the prophet in verse 16 expressly locates it in the future; *how* the Coming of the Son of Man, Matt. 24 : 29, 30, "*immediately after*" the tribulation spoken of can be a Coming *before* the same; *how* even the Coming of a man can be a spiritual Coming, etc.? Will they prove that there is *no priority* in the resurrection, in the judgment, in the gathering of the elect, in the position of nations in the Kingdom; that they understand the ordinary use of language *better* (see many comments on Rev. 20, and the declarations that it "*cannot possibly mean*" what we contend for) than men who wrote and spoke it as the early Church; that Christ's Second Advent, instead of fulfilling the Scriptures in bringing salvation, through a glorious Kingdom, to saints and nations, really "*exhausts the object of the Scriptures;*" that *the unchanging* Priesthood of Christ comes *to an end* at the Sec. Advent? In advocating the ending of the Kingdom given to Jesus Christ, will they tell us what to do with the passages predicting *its perpetuity;* in applying Isa. 63 : 1–6 to the First Advent, will they explain how this blood, etc., of His enemies can *be transmuted* into His own blood; in interpreting Dan. 7, will they inform us by what reasoning they make the Coming of "the Son of Man" *to precede* the divided form of the Roman Empire, the rise of the horns and the little horn; in postponing the Second Advent until after the definite Millennial era still future, will they show *how it is possible* to occupy the posture commanded of looking, watching, and praying for that Advent; in asserting that the Old Testament must only be viewed through the New, will they teach us why this is preferable to our saying that Old and New (containing the Will of God) must be considered as embracing *a whole* so that one serves to illustrate the other;[1] in adverting to differences (although in essentials a unit, viz., as to the covenanted Kingdom) of opinion on some points as an objection to the doctrine itself, will they make known to us why such a rule of judgment should not be *even more applicable* to themselves, seeing that they cannot agree in defining the Kingdom? If the mixed condition of the Church, if the Antichristian powers, are to exist down to the very Advent, let them inform us *how* the Millennial descriptions that "all shall be righteous," etc., can be realized *before* that Advent; if all the blessings forfeited by sin are not restored, can they tell us in what *the completeness* of restoration and restitution consists? These and similar questions we earnestly desire to be answered and to be answered by a direct (not inferential) appeal to Scripture, and to the same grammatical sense (unless this is shown to be invalid) which they employ to sustain other great, cardinal doctrines of the Word. They defend the birth, life, death, etc., of Jesus Christ, the rest of the doctrines of Salvation, the character, attributes, etc., of God, the sinfulness of man and necessity for Redemption, etc., by this sense; they deem their position on any other point *impregnable* if sustained by this sense, and hence when we find ourselves *so amply sustained* by it, we are *justified in maintaining it* until it is clearly made manifest that this sense opposes our doctrine.[2]

[1] Dr. Fairbairn and a few others form an exception here since they believe, with us, that the Divine Purpose of God relating to the future is to be ascertained through the prophecies of Old and New.

[2] We present the following as a fair specimen of the style of argumentation adopted: Dr. Swartz (*Luth. Observer*, Feb. 10th, 1882) insists that the world is far better and cannot possibly fall back into its old sins, as follows: "Those pessimist Millenarians who are evermore prophesying evil days, and are telling the world that before the Millennium it will be as in the days of Noah, prophesy of evils *which Christianity has made impossible.*" Then Jesus and His Apostles were also "pessimists," and grossly mistook the design of the present dispensation, for we *take their own words* and believe in them. Ten thousand just as unscriptural declarations are popularly proclaimed and received, indicative of the prevailing lack of faith in some of the plainest teachings of the Word.

PROPOSITION 178. *This doctrine of the Kingdom, and its essentially related subjects, are so hostile to their faith, that numerous organized religious bodies totally reject them.*

These doctrines, once so precious to the early Church, have not, and cannot have, a place in their expressed systems of belief. Simple consistency forbids their incorporation, seeing that they stand opposed to their fundamental tenets respecting the covenants, the Christ, the Church, Redemption, etc. (comp. previous Prop.).

Obs. 1. While in the aggregate Pre-Millenarians form a respectable body, and are found (as e.g. evidenced in the Proph. Conferences in England and America) in various denominations, yet in comparison with the immense body which rejects our doctrine they form a small minority, thus according with the Spirit's prediction. The fact is, that large religious organizations exclude it from their respective systems of faith; that many sects condemn it as "an exploded superstition;" and that even those who may tolerate it in individual believers, as a body do not give it any official sanction, but rather seek to crush it. Works on Systematic Theology, designed for general guidance, either entirely omit any references to our doctrine, or, if mentioned, give it in a brief mutilated form with a lengthy rejoinder, without allowing our main reasons to appear.

From Romanism, Unitarianism, Universalism, etc., we can only anticipate a decided rejection, but from none of these have originated works specially directed against our doctrine. It is in the Presbyterian, Reformed, Lutheran, Episcopal, Methodist, Baptist, and Congregationalist communities that we find the authors who devote themselves to a persistent and bitter attack upon us. Reference is frequently made to such in the present work, and to the arguments employed. Some of the doctrines thus rejected may be briefly enumerated; no faith in the Kingdom as covenanted and predicted (must be spiritualized); no faith in the Abrahamic covenant (unless spiritualized); no faith in the everlasting Davidic covenant (excepting in the seed promised); no faith in a Pre-Mill. Sec. Advent; no faith in the signs preceding the Advent; no faith in the announced design of this dispensation; no faith in the delineations of the Church; no faith in the hopes and expectations of pious Jews; no faith in the preaching of the disciples; no faith in the teaching of the primitive Church; no faith in the postponement of the Kingdom to the Second Advent (the Church being substituted); no faith in the predictions relating to the Jewish nations (the blessings promised to it being duly appropriated and the curses left to it); no faith in the inheritance of David's Son, in a Pre-Mill. resurrection and translation, in the saint's inheritance, in the personal agency of Jesus to introduce Mill. blessedness, the reign of the Christ and His saints on earth, in the complete restoration of all forfeited blessings, in the proper Judgeship, Judgment Day, World to Come, Day of the Lord Jesus, etc.; in brief, no faith in "the things of the Kingdom," "the Gospel of the Kingdom."

Obs. 2. Under the plea of Church authority (by which is understood the confessional standards, or the utterances of distinguished writers, etc.) our doctrine is repudiated because at variance with the systems of faith

elaborated. And this is the more amazing when these same advocates of the alleged faith of the Church pass by as unworthy of credence, and as utterly unauthoritative, *the expressed belief* of the Apostolic and Primitive Church. Surely if Church authority has any special weight in establishing the true faith, it certainly ought to be found in the Church which had the advantage of the teaching of the apostles, elders, and their immediate successors.

Even the views of Reformers (as Luther, Calvin, etc.) are deliberately ignored or denied, as illustrated by us in the history of the doctrine. There is a disposition in many never to receive a doctrine unless certain favorite writers also receive it. Thus thousands reject Millenarianism simply because learned men, in whom they repose confidence, refuse to accept of it. Thus imitating the multitude at the First Advent, who followed the lead of the Pharisees, Scribes, and Rulers. To realize the prediction that the Church shall have no faith in Christ's Coming, it is requisite that the leaders of the people should, by precept and example, pave the way. This, alas, is done.

Obs. 3. Ecclesiastical bodies in their general meetings totally ignore the commanded posture of watching. Indeed if any one should have the temerity to offer a resolution recommending the Scripture attitude, and presenting the imminency of the Sec. Advent, he would be ridiculed by the large majority. The tender of such a resolution, or one in reference to the covenanted Messianic Kingdom, would be offensive, since the spirit, business, and tendency of such meetings, confidently look for perpetuity, continued prosperity, the conversion of the world, an extension of a present Messianic Kingdom through their instrumentality.

The general meetings of denominations are, almost always, introduced and enforced by unscriptural Post-Millennial appeals. To enforce these, Scripture is wrested from its connection and confidently quoted. Thus to illustrate : Dr. Ort, as President, in opening the General Synod (of 1879, Evang. Luth. Church), presses into his service, to support his Whitbyan predictions, Isa. 63 as follows : " When *we see* Him coming from Edom and with dyed garments from Bozrah, glorious in apparel and travelling in the greatness of His strength, speaking in righteousness and mighty to save—it is the Missionary of the Almighty that we behold." This may answer as the adornment of a sermon in sound, but it is a perversion of Scripture, applying to the present what relates to the future. But this is common.

Obs. 4. One feature alone evidences the spirit and aim of the Church, and that is the endowment system so largely adopted by individual congregations, synodical bodies, religious organizations, etc. Investments in real estate, mortgages, bonds, and stocks are made in a manner *so declarative of perpetuity,* of the Lord delaying His Coming, of faith in the conversion of the world, etc., that it manifests a wide departure from the scriptural injunction and the primitive belief. These endowments, tending to the support and ease of many able men, rivet the prevailing unbelief by *the personal interest* involved in their continuance. It is hard to make the sacrifices which the simple truth demands. It is noteworthy that the richer the endowments, the more extended the investments, the less inclination is there to return to the early belief of the Church.

If the student will turn to the history of our doctrine, he will find that just so soon as the Church arose from its depressed condition and, through the emperors and the gifts of the wealthy, possessed large endowments, the early faith was discarded as hostile to the spirit, condition, and aims of the Church. The entire endowment system, which directs the funding of the principal and the interest only to be expended in the promotion of some pious scheme, is based on *the Lord's delaying His Coming.* It is a worldly policy, founded on the idea of perpetuity, introduced into almost every communion and

largely practised ; which unmistakably declares that, at least for a very long time, there is no necessity to look and pray for the Lord's Coming. Many even boast of this wealth thus amassed, not knowing, as God's predictions unmistakably show, that they are thus saved and hoarded up eventually to fall into the hands of the terrible persecuting enemies of the Church. Imagine, if you can, the Apostles and the elders with their expressed views concerning the expectant attitude of believers, asking for and commending such perpetual endowments and investments! The funded revenues of many denominations are a source of hostility to our doctrine, seeing that it protests against them because of their advocacy of perpetuity over against the commands, cautions, and rebukes of the Divine Master.

Obs. 5. In many of our congregations this doctrine is an interdicted subject (as the writer knows from personal observation and experience), and what a writer (*Proph. Times*, vol. 6, p. 176) confessed, many can truthfully declare : "Although trained and educated in the—Church, I know no more about the Second Coming of Christ and His reign on the earth than a heathen in the jungles of India knows of the story of the Cross." Indeed such regard the doctrine as fanaticism and heresy, and do not desire their pulpits to announce the warnings of Jesus, or to exhibit the primitive faith and its scriptural foundations.

Indeed, where pulpits are supplied by Pre-Millenarians, efforts are made to close them against them. A number of such cases, including professorships, etc., have fallen under my own observation. To illustrate the spirit : The *Advance* of Chicago reports the facts in a case which occurred July 14th, 1878, in that city. Dr. Goodwin, the pastor of the First Congregational Church, preached a series of discourses on the Kingdom of Christ and His Sec. Coming, presenting the views of Moody, etc. At the close of the last discourse, Rev. Hammond, a member, read a protest publicly—which led to confusion—against the doctrines proclaimed as non-spiritual, Judaistic, unscriptural, discouraging to prayer and efforts to convert the world, multiplying religious croakers, delusive, revolutionary, etc. "Greybeard" in his *Lay Sermons*, No. 106, referring to Christ's Sec. Coming and its preciousness, adds : "We might suppose, therefore, that the prospective 'appearing' of Christ would form a prominent feature in the preaching and teaching of the Christian ministry ; yet there is no part of revelation more habitually overlooked ;" and he declares it to be regarded "either with indifference or with positive dread." Dr. Leask (*Proph. Times*, vol. 6, p. 144) even reports two ministers, "who have been preaching against the Pre-Millennial Advent from the text, 'Where is the promise of His Coming?'" They certainly must have utterly discarded the context, or else they were willing to be numbered among the predicted "scoffers." While some have the hardihood thus to use it, many would gladly do so—have the inclination—if the reference in the context to the "scoffers" did not prevent them, for they virtually indorse the question in other forms and answer it in a similar manner. Observe e.g. 1 Thess. 5 : 2, 3, 4, and 2 Thess. 2 : 5, 15, and see how familiar those early converts were, through the teaching of an Apostle, with the things relating to the Sec. Advent. Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 104) well says : "There are thousands of ordained clergymen at the present day who really plume themselves on their profound ignorance of a truth perfectly familiar, more than eighteen hundred years ago, to men, women, and children just delivered from idolatry, and who give as an excuse for this ignorance that they are occupied with something more important than that which the inspired Apostle thought it needful to teach at the very beginning of his ministry among the Thessalonians." And (p. 106) again he remarks : "Can these things be of less importance now, when the lapse of eighteen hundred years has certainly brought us that much nearer the great event to which the minds of the early Christians were habitually turned in eager waiting and watching? Surely it does not become the disciples of Christ to speak slightingly of a truth to which the Holy Ghost has assigned *the chief place* in the first communications He was pleased to make, no less for our instruction, than for the benefit of those to whom they were immediately addressed." Alas! what a marked and general departure from the teaching and attitude of the early Church!

Obs. 6. The religious press, which has such a powerful denominational influence, is almost *en masse* against us. Quarterlies, monthlies, weeklies,

and reviews not only refuse to publish articles from us, but delight to insert anything that may cast detraction upon the doctrine. They cater to the taste and bow to the influence of the preponderating majority, and thus secure their patronage. It is felt that our doctrine is so antagonistic, to the prevailing views of the various denominations, that the press avoids giving our views in detail, and contents itself with presenting articles opposed to us, or in quoting that which may bring ridicule upon us.

A few papers (a rare indulgence) have the manliness to publish some articles in our favor, and to such our thanks are extended. The late Convention of Pre-Millenarians, held in Dr. Tyng's church, New York (1878), brought out the *animus* of the religious press. It was joyfully reported that "it is a notable fact that the religious press of New York City have given no welcome or aid to the Conference of Second Adventists held in that city. In fact, some of the prominent papers have denounced the whole affair as foolish in the extreme," etc. Dr. Tyng and others remarked that no favor could be obtained from them. This is true almost everywhere, and has necessitated the publication of papers and monthlies specially devoted to the subject. Many leading and influential journals utterly refuse the insertion of a single article, even if only confined to the historical questions respecting the doctrine. They seem *to be afraid* of its antiquity, and of the noble array of advocates in the past and present. Friends of mine, as well as myself, have knocked at the door in vain. As a prominent professor wrote to me: "It is scarcely worth while to apply to a Post-Millenarian editor; they gladly publish articles against us and ask for us to support their respective publications, but refuse us a hearing. The bitterness of many papers is notorious, and to excite prejudice against us everything that conveys a sarcasm or ridicule is eagerly published with evident relish." Thus e.g. to illustrate: The *Luth. Observer*, Aug. 23d, 1878, gives Pres. Porter's remarks against Moody's Chiliasm, and also states that "Dr. Edward Beecher characterized the doctrine of Millenarianism as 'beginning in the spirit and being made perfect in the flesh.'" Let the reader refer back to our history of the doctrine and see for himself the eminent sons of the Church, the martyrs, missionaries, etc., that are thus grossly slandered by Beecher and the paper indorsing his utterance. In the next number (Aug. 30th) it reproduces an article from the *Independant* entitled, "Wise Overmuch," which starts out in abuse of Moody and Tyng, Jr., because they believe in the commanded posture of watching for the speedy, visible Coming of the Christ, saying in derision: "Perhaps the doctrine may seem to be fitted to frighten drowsy sinners. We are inclined to think that a textual study of the Bible, seeking for hidden meanings and deep types and allegories, to which some of these Millenarians are given, makes them ready to accept of the improbable, and to imagine that therein they are honoring the Word." After this sneer at the motives and biblical study of prophetic students, there follows a torturing of Scripture to make out that Millenarians are "troubling the churches on this subject." Thus e.g. "some inquisitive and meddlesome saints of Thessalonica—and we have such now—would be likely, St. Paul knew, to turn away from the comfort (i.e. as united with the resurrection, etc.) to speculate about the speediness of the Lord's Coming. The Apostles, therefore, instantly anticipated their curiosity and rebuked it, saying, 'But of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you.'" What *a master-stroke of exegesis!* How it eclipses the comments of our commentators, by simply *ignoring the context and analogy* of the Word! We are then informed that Paul rebukes them again in the Second Epistle; that the Second Coming is substantially the resurrection of the dead (!); and should be treated of simply as a reference to immortality and future rewards and punishments (!); that Millenarians are "guilty of clear disobedience to the inspired instructions" when insisting that the Advent is imminent or impending; that when they refer to "times and seasons," which, "says Paul, are something not necessary to write about," and which Jesus rebuked in the words "It is not for you to know the times and seasons," and which as to day and hour no one knows, they are guilty of "a presumption little less than blasphemous." It concludes, respecting this "presumption" bordering on blasphemy: "We see it on every side, in a mild form, as exemplified in the Chiliasm of the two largest Lutheran bodies in the country, and in the teachings of Mr. Moody, Dr. S. H. Tyng, Jr., and Dr. Goodwin; and more grossly in the babble of Adventists, Timeists, Dr. Wild, Dr. Seiss, and the Pyramidologists, who hold that we are now in a narrow passage of the Pyramids, which indicates 'troublous times' from 1876 to 1882, preceding the Coming of Christ. 'Let no man deceive you by any means.'" Such is a fair specimen of many articles which refute themselves by their grossness, indiscriminate

denunciation, lack of scriptural knowledge, and a careful ignoring of the foundations of our faith. When such instruction is constantly paraded and such invectives are continually exhibited, what must, necessarily, be *the result* among the masses?

To illustrate how means are employed to excite hostility against us and to enforce the faithlessness of the Church, we refer to the use made by the religious press of the Freeman tragedy. From the published accounts and the trial, it appears that Freeman fanatically deemed himself called on by a divine vision, or Supernatural call, to kill his own child as a sacrifice demanded of his faith, being, as he thought, assured of speedy restoration to life. It happened that Freeman belonged to the "Second Adventists." This was too good an opportunity to be lost, no matter how many similar acts had occurred through fanaticism in persons of other beliefs, and the press throughout the country utilized it to decry Pre-Millennialism, the study of prophecy, etc. The secular press joined in the cry, so that e.g. the New York *Tribune* in an editorial, exhibits its amazing knowledge of the whole subject by classing Second Adventists, Fifth-Monarchy men, Anabaptists, Cromwellians, Brethren of the Free Spirit, and Pre-Millenarians together, and makes this sacrifice *a legitimate outgrowth* of prophetical studies, thus indirectly vilifying the ablest and purest men who have been students of prophecy. The dogmatic, magisterial, offensive tone of the secular and political papers was effectually reproduced by the religious press, which overlooked the fact that the religion it professed forbade *the wholesale slandering* in which it indulged at our expense. Thus e.g. the *Luth. Observer*, whose editor rarely failed to pick up any floating sarcasm against us, found "the Freeman Tragedy" a specially fine morsel for an editorial (May 30th, 1878) with the significant heading: "Prophetic Fanaticism." The article is designed to make the impression, most unjustly, that this sacrifice is an outgrowth of Pre-Mill. doctrine. The writer undertakes to show how such delusions as Freeman's are reached (1) by affirming that this is done "through an attempt to interpret the prophecies in a literal sense." We deny this conclusion. (*a*) Ecclesiastical history proves to us (as e.g. Stilling has well pointed out in his *Theobald*, etc.) that more dreadful delusions, culminating at times in murder, have resulted from the spiritualistic and mystical interpretation; (*b*) Freeman, as the trial evidenced, did not confine himself to a literal interpretation, but was so largely under the influence of *a prevailing spiritual and mystical* interpretation that he looked for continued revelations of God's will, and in his hallucinations supposed himself to be thus personally favored; (*c*) one of the fundamental principles of our teaching is the completeness of revelation in this dispensation to guide and direct, while the contrary is the result of mystical and spiritualistic teaching, which opens the door to all sorts of vagaries; (*d*) it is unjust to charge us with a crime, which our teaching and tendency reprobate; (*e*) it is unjust to the long line of noble men in the Church who, although "interpreting the prophecies in a literal sense," have been noted for purity of life and usefulness in labor; (*f*) it is unjust to the "Second Adventists" as a body (although their views in many respects differ from ours, and are more in accord with this editor's than ours), seeing that many, and their ablest advocates, limit their teaching within bounds that forbids so sad and fearful a result; (*g*) it is unjust to charge this sacrifice upon the faith of any body of men, because it was the individual act of a weak, unbalanced mind, excited by religious fanaticism, fostered by a mystical tendency which led him to regard himself as favored by divine revelation.* Then (2) the writer declares that a literal interpretation is incorrect (*a*) because the Church affirms it to be such. Where he gets this affirmation from we are at a loss to conceive; certainly not from Luther, whom he professes to admire. (For an extended reply, see Prop. 4.) He then (*b*) asserts: "that most of the prophecies concerning the *First* Coming of Christ were not fulfilled in a literal, but in a figurative or spiritual, sense, like many other prophecies, and for this reason they were not understood until after their fulfilment." We deny that any of the prophecies were

---

* Every intelligent reader has met with cases reported where crime—even murder—has been committed under an alleged religious guidance, but that such have been justly ascribed to the individual, and not to the Church to which he belonged. We give a single illustration: *Every Evening* (of Wilmington, Del., and copied in the *Geauga Leader*, June 13th, 1879) cites the case of Gilles Hutchins, who was tried twenty-two years ago in the Georgetown court for the murder of his own child, and acquitted on the ground of insanity. He had attended a Methodist meeting, and heard a sermon concerning Abraham and the sacrifice of Isaac. Being under conviction and excited, he imagined, as a test of his own faith, that God commanded him to offer up his own child The tragedy followed. It would, of course, be utterly unjust to charge the Methodists, as a body, with the morbid, feverish excitement and imaginings of this murderer.

spiritually or figuratively fulfilled, but all as grammatically expressed ; and it was this very literal fulfilment in the person, life, and death of Jesus that we, to-day, employ against Jewish and Gentile unbelief, as seen in the Christian apologetical writings. It is the Church-Kingdom view that confuses the writer's idea of fulfilment ; for, in support of such an opinion, he must of necessity largely draw on spiritualizing. In reference to the old declaration that prophecies are only to be understood after their fulfilment, replies are given under various propositions. It is sufficient now to say that, if this is so, then it is difficult to explain the rebukes of Jesus and the exhortations to study prophecy, to regard it as a light, to esteem it as a warning (of which e.g. the believers availed themselves before the destruction of Jerusalem), etc. But (3) he declares that all expecting the literal Second Advent have been, from the day of ascension down, disappointed. Suppose that they have been, does that change the commanded posture of watching? Did it detract from their piety or motives to faithfulness? Did not the Spirit which urged, in view of personal benefit, etc., this attitude which they obediently occupied, know that they would be disappointed? Are we to neglect watching for a certain predicted event, in which redemption and glory culminate, because it has not yet arrived, and because others, who thought it might soon arrive, were disappointed in its coming? Such and similar questions evidence that, according to the writer's estimate, the divine injunctions on this point are a mistake, and that the history of the past should cause us not to look, long, and pray for "the Blessed Hope." (Comp. the caution of Mark 13 : 33-37.) He concludes with the sweeping assertion : "It is only the ignorant and illiterate that are deluded by this fanaticism" (viz., literal prophetical interpretation). But as if conscience pricked him somewhat at the vast array of able writers on its side, he generously adds : "It has a strange fascination also for some learned and otherwise well-balanced and sensible persons," but who have "a kind of mental hypnotism," etc. The mental capacity of the editors may indeed be great, but they certainly do not add to its greatness or afford proof of the same, by such an attack, only calculated to produce prejudice, and confirm the unbelief of the Church.

Obs. 7. The mass of the Church, both in ministry and laity, is so leavened with the spirit of unbelief and opposition, that threats of excommunication, deposal, etc., are boldly announced, notwithstanding the antiquity, antecedents, reception, scriptural foundation of the doctrine. Not satisfied to meet us in argument, to deny our "hope," to make it ridiculous, to pervert or ignore history, to brand us as guilty of "heresy," etc., the antagonism must culminate *in threats*, as e.g. illustrated recently in Prof. Briggs of New York, whose spirit and that of the Romanist Baronius (whom he approvingly quotes) correspond.

Prof. Briggs, alarmed at the number of his Presbyterian brethren who were Pre-Millenarian, and finding that his attacks were resolutely and Scripturally met, finally condescended *to threaten* them, if they did not yield up their "heresy" and omit meeting in public conferences on the subject, with an ecclesiastical trial. Fortunately many of his brethren were more in accord with Paul's delineation of charity, and deemed such a course too extreme. But the spirit is abroad and widening. A writer in the *Interior*, Jan. 9th, 1879, quotes Dr. Brookes as saying in the *Truth :* "Not only is there opposition, but the most determined hostility to the doctrine of our Lord's personal return as the hope set before us in the Gospel, and he who is 'looking for that blessed hope' is sure to be denounced as a fanatic, and slandered, and ostracized." This statement is questioned, but is—as e.g. illustrated in "Westminster's" (Prof. Briggs) attacks, charges of heresy, arrogant threats of expulsion, and in the numerous articles in various religious papers manifesting the same spirit, of which we give in this work a few specimens—abundantly sustained. A movement is now on foot to remove a brother holding these views from a high and responsible position, solely because of his teaching our doctrine, and this has been repeated again and again within a few years. The writer knows persons who, either have been forced from their pastorates, or have been unable to secure any, through the machinations of ministers and laymen who opposed them because Pre-Millenarians. Such are not merely in the sleeping condition reprimanded by the Master, but they are sufficiently aroused and interested to fight, openly and secretly, against the doctrine. Rev. Dr. Goodwin, in his address before the Prophetic Conference, said that he anticipated bitter hostility from the very men who ought to extend Christian love—

from men who teach theology, occupy the pulpits of the land, and direct the great denominational and religious newspapers of the day. This has been manifested repeatedly, and, judging from human nature, must be anticipated in the future. We do not envy the minds and hearts of those who, overlooking the fundamental test of charity, can carry our belief—a belief placing us in the commanded posture assigned by Jesus Himself—up to the ecclesiastical tribunals of the churches to have it, if possible, condemned as "heresy," and its holders ignominiously expelled. Aside from ignoring history, Scriptural evidence, Christian love, etc., it exemplifies an innate meanness of disposition, a devilish desire to involve brethren in difficulties, diminish their reputation, usefulness, and happiness—a characteristic *which even many unbelievers would spurn as dishonorable.* These remarks apply equally to that class of Millenarians, of whatever sect or party, who designate all who do not receive their distinctive views or system as non-Christian, overlooking their personal reception of Jesus and the manifestation of the graces of the Spirit.

Obs. 8. The faith of multitudes is influenced by that expressed by pious and useful laborers of the Church, and when our doctrine—which evidently has never been studied, either in its historical or scriptural aspects—is curtly dismissed by them as unworthy of credence or attention, the reputation, the godly life of such sways many to treat it with indifference and even with contempt. Misrepresentations, perversions, detractions, expressed or implied disdain, coming from such a source become measurably authoritative in the eyes of not a few, forgetting, as the history of the Church abundantly proves, that error may exist in connection with great piety, fervor, zeal, and usefulness.

It is painful to notice how men eminent for piety, under *the profession of humility,* that they are not to meddle with things too high, condemn our doctrine, without even an examination, and *then think themselves sufficiently humble,* and the things sufficiently low, to give a positive, dogmatic expression of their views pertaining to Eschatology. They deem themselves strong enough to give us a complete system pertaining to future things, but when we endeavor to present the same, then the cry is raised, "Secret things belong to God." This affected modesty does not prevent them from leaving "the milk" and seeking "the strong meat," from entering into "the deep things of God" and attempting to explain them, from occupying the domain of prophecy and endeavoring to interpret and apply the same; but let us attempt this course, and instantly the charge of presumption is presented against us. Indeed, in justification of their own procedure they justly claim that these things are revelations, written for our study and instruction, and hence worthy of attention; but as soon as our interpretation and application of them are made, they object on the ground that they are beyond our understanding, etc. Take e.g. one of the mildest illustrations of our meaning: J. A. James, in *The Church in Earnest* (a work containing excellent thoughts and forcibly expressed), expresses (p. 289) his humility as follows: "How many centuries shall roll before this blessed era (Millennium) of harmonized, sanctified humanity shall arrive—how much more of its history our world is to spend in sin and rebellion, and in groans and tears, it is not for any of us to say. Some imagine they hear the clocks of prophecy and providence, both set in harmony to the divine decree, striking the eleventh hour. I am not so skilled in prophetical arithmetic or mystic symbols; 'it is not *for me* to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in His own power;' and I am content with the promise and the hope, that the time is coming, when 'the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ.' What vials of wrath have yet to be exhausted upon the world, or through what tribulations the Church has yet to pass on her way to her millennial, and to her triumphal state, it is not for us *even to conjecture,*" etc. After this exhibition of personal modesty, and under its garb to deal a stab at noble students of prophecy, one should suppose that he is simply "content with the promise and the hope," and makes *no effort* to explain it and the manner of its realization. But the reverse is true: he enters the field of controversy, and his published statements are open to investigation and criticism. At length, against the most positive statements of God's Word, by the use of mistaken inferences and the quotation of Scripture passages isolated from their connection, he endeavors to prove that the Millennium and its glory is introduced by the labors of the Church. To make out such a proof the parables are made antago-

nistic to each other, the commission is made to declare what it does not contain, sentences detached from their context are pressed to an extreme, Millennial predictions are given without reference to the order of fulfilment, the agency of Jesus and the necessity for the supernatural to intervene to bring forth a realization are ignored, the Sec. Advent is taken for granted as delayed for centuries, etc., and the grand result of this extremely modest effort is to emphatically teach (p. 291) that "the direct and chief instruments of accomplishing this greatest of all happy revolutions—this wondrous spiritual renovation," of bringing in "the Millennial glory," are "the ministers of religion and the members of our churches," "Yes, these are the men to whom the world will stand indebted for its restoration to God, to happiness, and immortality." What *a sad perversion* of Scripture teaching on the subject! He winds up his work with the double italicized sentence, showing the emphasis given to it: "What is wanted—and all that is wanted, under God's blessing, for the world's conversion to Christ, is—an earnest ministry, and an earnest Church." How different the instruction and the warnings given by the Spirit! Such illustrations could be multiplied, and they serve to show that, in view of the character and reputation of the men, their example and teaching form a pattern which many copy, some taking it for granted that whatever emanates from them must be good, while others rest satisfied with their one-sided exhibition of the subject. Sometimes even long refutations appear which contain no appeal whatever to the Scriptures, the more remarkable seeing that our constant reference is to the Word. Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 19) says: "Recently a very long article from the pen of a distinguished Theological professor appeared against the Pre-Mill. Advent, and it did not contain a single text of Scripture," and then aptly adds: "There could hardly be stronger presumptive proof of the doctrine he so bitterly denounced." No matter what the piety, or position, or talents of the writer on the subject, in Eschatology, which God gives us, appeal must be made to the Spirit.

Obs. 9. It is not merely the controversial books and articles (such as Brown's, Waldegrave's, etc.) that tend to this rejection of our doctrine, but a multitude of works are issued, either by private individuals or societies, which take the opposite for granted, and predict in a dogmatic form "smooth things" for the Church. These are extensively circulated and read, and thus by precept and example confirm the existing faithlessness. Indeed, it is a fact that many are so familiarized to such a "Church Literature," that they are utterly unacquainted with our doctrines, and the scriptural reasons assigned in their behalf.

Among these may be mentioned popular commentaries, specially designed to mould the opinions of Sunday-schools. Thus e.g. Albert Barnes's series of *Notes*. To illustrate its spirit, a single example is sufficient: When explaining prophecy relating to the Millennial age, he constantly weakens the force of the promises by a set phraseology indicative of a lack of faith in its plain, grammatical meaning. The favorite phrase is "*as if*;" and to give it due emphasis and impress it on the favorable notice of the reader it is generally printed in italic letters. Take up any Mill. description at random (or particularly the Apoc.), and the interpretation will have its italic dress. Take, as an illustration, Isa. 65 : 17-25, and we have the following examples: "That there should be a state of glory as great *as if* a new heaven and new earth were to be made;" "that there would be changes in the condition of the people of God as great *as if* the heavens, overcast with clouds and subject to storms, should be re-created so as to become always mild and serene, or *as if* the earth, so barren in many places, should become universally fertile and beautiful:" "changes as great *as if* a barren and sterile world should become universally beautiful and fertile;" "the change is represented to be as great *as if* a new heaven and a new earth should be created;" "it is figurative language designed to describe the comparatively happy state referred to by the prophet, *as if* human life should be lengthened out to the age of the patriarchs, and *as if* he who is now regarded as an old man should then be regarded as in the vigor of his days;" "that is, that the state of things under the Messiah would be *as if* human life were greatly prolonged;" "changes shall take place as great *as if* his nature (lion's) were changed, and he should graze with the herds of the field;" "the state of security would be as great under the Messiah *as if* the most deadly and poisonous kinds of reptiles should become wholly innoxious, and should not attempt to prey upon men;" "in future times, there will be a state of security as great

as if the whole serpent tribe were innocuous and should live on the dust alone." This is *no caricature*, but a specimen found under one prediction alone, and is written by a sincere, pious, and able man, who leads thousands into such faithless interpretations. One cannot help imagining how such a commentator, with such a faith, constantly appealing to the impossibility of fulfilment, would have dealt with the predictions relating to Jesus, had he lived to comment on them *just before* the First Advent. We fancy that the prediction of a virgin conceiving and bearing Him would, with such a spirit, have been interpreted to mean a figurative expression indicating a purity as great *as if* He had been born of a virgin ; the predictions pertaining to His humiliation, sufferings, and death, would mean a condescension or spirit of benevolence as great *as if* He had actually passed through it all ; the predictions relating to His being sold for money, betrayed, forsaken, despised, beaten and spit on, drinking vinegar, casting lots, etc., would mean that He exercised the most extraordinary patience and forbearance, as great *as if* men had really treated Him so fearfully.

The works *Witnessing Church, The Active Christian, The Great Commission, The World's Salvation, Redeemer's Last Command, Evangelization of the World,* and literally hundreds of others (comp. Prop. 175), present the idea of a future Millennial age, give many of its predicted characteristics, but urge, as an incentive to action, that it must result from preaching the Gospel, extending missions, widening and increasing the zeal and activity of the Church. Christ's specific and supernatural work is relegated to the Church, and only so much of the Scripture is quoted and applied as they suppose inferentially to teach the same ; while that portion antagonistic is carefully excluded, no attempt being even made toward a reconciliation. The positive manner of presentation, the frequent eloquent and fervent appeals attached, the interlarding of Scripture phraseology, mislead the masses ; and in view of the praises extended to them and the efforts made to circulate them by eminent men and societies, they become favorites and guides to multitudes. To object to their teaching as on many essential points erroneous, and to their tendency as producing a lack of faith in "the Blessed Hope," is to cause many—so wedded are they to them—to question our piety and zeal. Under such exclusive instruction, which really perverts the divine as given to us, the masses, interpreting Scripture in a like manner, are unable to discriminate, and become prejudiced against an examination of the subject.

Obs. 10. The state of no faith, the indifference to the subject, the interposing of long periods, etc., is also in a measure produced by the long-delayed return of Jesus. Good men like Luther, etc., expected His return in their day, and able men like Bengel, etc., fixed upon approximative dates, but these expectations and data passed by without His return, and many, because of the non-fulfilment, remain sunken in a state of apathy and unbelief—just as if the event depended on man's estimate or measuring of time, and not on God's own appointment. More than this : such disappointments are made the subject of scoffing, in order to heap ridicule upon the whole subject.

Since eighteen hundred years have passed, some act and speak as if this very delay meant a far longer one in the future ; while others assert that it is proof that He will never come. Both misapprehend the Spirit's estimate of time. The class, like Elihu Burritt, etc., who deny a future Sec. Advent, making it already past ; those, like Swedenborgians, etc., who transform it into something else ; those who admit its futurity, but make providence death, etc., also Advents, and intervene a long indefinite period ; those who ignore it as an idle fable ; all classes unite in taking advantage of the expressed hopes of Millenarians, and, because not realized, to make themselves merry at their expense. The antedating of the Advent and the Millennial age (the latter done even by many of our opponents), can only affect the faith of the weak, or ignorant, or prejudiced ; the student, who knows the foundation upon which all rests, makes even these—the disappointments, scoffings, and unbelief—reasons *why* he should be the more observant and watchful. Scoffing is no argument ; ridicule is no adornment of the truth ; and names of obloquy add no force to reasoning. The vagaries of some individual, or the dogmatic assertions in reference to definite time by some person or sect, are gladly paraded, as if these were amply sufficient to crush our doctrine based on covenants and a multitude of divine promises ; as if these should, of necessity, force us to say, "My

Lord delayeth His Coming," or "Where is the promise of His Coming?" as if these could override the solid Scriptural statements of able and learned men, and cause us no longer to look, pray, long, and watch for "the Blessed Hope." The perversion of any one point, or the rashness of men in dealing with a doctrine—seeing that every important truth of the Bible has been, by some, either perverted or rashly dealt with—*has no weight with the real student.* He knows that failure as to time, that rashness and enthusiasm as to the meaning of symbolic prophecies, that dogmatic assertions based on chronology, that approximative applications which resolve themselves into mistakes—all these do not touch *the covenanted relationship* of the Kingdom, the Pre-Millennial Advent, or any one of the main, leading, or essential doctrines of our system. And yet men profess themselves as confirmed in their unbelief by the failure of learned expositions on prophecy, which enter into a systematic chronological series of events, and virtually, by approximation or positively, predict events to take place at certain times that are not verified. This failure causes them to regard an elucidation of prophecy with suspicion, and to turn from it with aversion—provided it has a Pre-Millennial cast. For when their own prophetical writers and commentators (as e.g. Barnes and others on the Apoc.) enter into a systematic chronological order and give approximative dates, or give place to the greatest vagaries and applications (as e.g. Berg, etc.), the whole thing is reversed; they justly claim that these are *individual opinions* which do not affect the main doctrines of a Post-Millennial Advent, Whitbyan Millennium, etc. The religious press, as we have shown, is eager to take up all such mistakes, individual extravagances, etc., and make Pre-Millenarianism responsible for them, a process of reasoning adopted by Draper and others, when they endeavor to make Christianity responsible for wars, persecutions, martyrdoms, etc. It is Bossuet's argument against Protestantism, levelled against our doctrine, in editorials headed "Prophecy at a Discount," etc. It is the infidel's mode of attack, *fully indorsed and adopted by believers!*

Obs. 11. Many writers, like M. Guizot (*Med. upon the Chris. Relig.*, etc.), seeing the predictions relative to an ultimate exaltation of the Church, take it for granted, by utilizing a philosophical idea of progress, that the Church will be universally dominant in the present dispensation. No effort is made to establish this by an examination of Scripture or of the early Church view, but we are left the option to accept of it, because in accordance with philosophy, the deductions of reason, and the wishes of human nature—thus occupying the same ground and urging the same considerations presented by the extreme Liberal party. Many intelligent and able men, leaders of others, indorse this development theory, and extend the prevailing unbelief.

To indicate what reasoning is employed, and a certain hesitancy manifested, by some in this direction, attention is directed to an interesting article in the *Bib. Sacra* for Jan., 1851, by Rev. Washburn. He forcibly shows that there is a parallel between the philosophical relations of early and modern Christianity; that the same antagonistic forces are now at work, and that history, only on a wider scale, is repeating itself. Then at the conclusion of the article, seeing where legitimately his own reasoning would lead him, viz., that such a repetition is to be ever anticipated as a natural result, he endeavors to rid himself of the same in the following manner. He says: "It is rather the design of God, while the foundations of the faith are eternal, to allow His religion to have its natural career, in connection with the free activity of the human intellect. Nor, while we have, and may have, in the creed and worship of Christianity, the settled ground-work of practical religion, may we expect to attain a perfect, changeless system of Christian science, until the advancing knowledge of man has reached its fullest harmony with the truths of revelation." He then anticipates an objection: "It may be said indeed that, allowing a necessary progression, in Christian science, it is a real progression, not a retrogression or a ceaseless oscillation, we should look for; and that, after eighteen centuries, it is somewhat discouraging to behold the world still in the state of primitive chaos. And viewed in itself it is so; viewed in regard to the self-will of men, it is lamentable; yet it is a fact, capable of an explanation that supplies hope and assurance. It has not been a retrogression, but, as has been said of social progress, 'an advancement in *a spiral line.*'" Looking for the explanation, we find it to be this: that certain causes lea to

certain results, without his being able to show that these may not continue to repeat themselves, and he is forced to say : "But we can only take refuge in a Christian optimism, and believe that as it (state of ours, etc.) sprang from natural and necessary causes, it will yet come out in a right channel;" and to illustrate it he brings in the Deluge, etc., while to enforce it, he says that "on every hand is felt the demand of reconstruction." Instead of leaving *God's Word tell* what the outcome shall be (as e.g. in the days of Noah, etc.), he expresses hope to be in this "spiral line." We quote him : "Such was and such is yet the chaotic state of Christendom ; such its phenomena and such their causes. Never since the birth of our religion has been seen so stupendous a conflict as has been waged between the truth of God and human error ; no other age, except the primitive, whatever its importance in philosophy or religious culture, can compare with this in which we live, in the grandeur of its efforts, the variety of its issues, the momentous problems which hang on its results. Nor have we yet reached its conclusion. The battle is not yet over," etc. "On the one side the transcendental unbeliever expects a time when Christianity shall be acknowledged the transient phenomenon of a less advanced period—a Millennium of pure reason in science, in art, in society, in worship being introduced ; on the other, the timid religionist sees only the signs of despair ; and, between the two, are found many who remain in utter doubt, hardly knowing whether to fear or hope the more for the cause of truth." He professes his confidence in the final result, because truth must ultimately triumph, faith "is the substance of that hoped for," primitive Christianity obtained the victory and so will the present, and as the struggle is greater and deeper, so the result will be greater, grander, and more permanent. Truth, indeed, will ultimately triumph, but not through man. Jesus, the Truth, will come Himself and vindicate it. Truth did not gain the victory from creation to the deluge, nor from the deluge to the First Advent, nor from the First Advent to the present ; and, we are abundantly assured from the predictions relating to the future, that it will not from the present time down to the Sec. Advent. (Comp. e.g. the remarks of *Ecce Deus-Homo* on the three great eras in the history of the race.) "Faith is indeed the substance of things hoped for," but it is still a question, which Scripture alone can decide, *when, and how, and through whom* the realization shall come. The primitive Christianity did not obtain the alleged victory, for the history of the Church conclusively proves that the Alexandrian philosophy, the hierarchical tendencies, etc. prevailed, and that colossal error gained the day, as witnessed in the fearful usurpations and the dark ages that followed. Analogy fails to sustain his position ; it does the reverse, indicating that there is *no hope in man.* How sad it is that able men bolster up a hope on such slender grounds, when *so flatly contradicted* by the predictions of the Word—our only safe guide in such matters—respecting both the condition of the world and the Church at the Second Advent of Jesus.

Obs. 12. It may probably be asked, Why is it that God allows so many prophets to arise and predict "peace and safety," and make the Church, as a body, complacently look forward to continued prosperity, increased wealth and power, and wide extended dominion? The reason was long ago assigned by Moses (Deut. 13 : 3) in the words : "for the Lord your God *proveth you*, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." It is done to test the love of His people, to discriminate between those who reverently receive all that He has spoken and honor His Son, and those who will follow the views and doctrines of men, giving the honor which exclusively belongs to the Son's work to men. When persons wilfully ignore oath-bound covenants, ridicule "the Blessed Hope," even the Coming of Jesus, and mock at the inheritance of Jesus and His saints, *then* it is but just that they should put their trust in smooth but false predictions instead of the Word of God.

Those who say that they do believe in a Second Advent, and that in consequence of such a belief do not come unto censure, are desired e.g. to ponder the express language of Jesus (Luke 12, Matt. 24, etc.), who rebukes, not unbelievers, but those *who profess to believe* in His Coming, because, notwithstanding their profession and His injunctions to a constant watchfulness, they say in their hearts, "*My Lord delayeth His Coming ;*" and their conduct is influenced by their belief in abusing their brethren (and by implication

those who look for the Coming), and in a sense of security leading—as illustrated in some —to scenes of revelry, feasting, festivals, etc., in the churches and families. As the end approaches it is reasonable to expect that a clearer conception of the nature of the Kingdom and its cognate doctrines will be presented, but this very exhibition will meet with continued unbelief and opposition. Some, misled by their own feelings, and enthusiastic over the number of Pre-Millenarians of eminence and ability in the various churches, trust that "The Doctrine of Christ's Coming and Reign is soon to be held by the Evangelical Church generally" (see e.g. an article thus entitled in the *Theol. and Lit. Journal*, Oct., 1859). But let the student consider the previous propositions, the predictions of God quoted, the condition of the Church previous to and at the Sec. Advent, and he will see that it is only after the thief-like Coming and before the open Parousiá of Jesus that the Church, startled from its indifference and unbelief and opposition by the resurrection and translation of chosen ones, will seek for the truth and in its behalf even sacrifice life itself.

PROPOSITION 179. *The doctrine of the Kingdom, or essentials of the same, are directly allied by various bodies with doctrines that are objectionable, and hence is made unpalatable to many.*

It is a sad fact that many persons not being able to discriminate between truth and error, reject both because they happen to be thus connected in the faith of some denomination or sect. Truth is not vitiated by error, for if it were, then there is not a single doctrine of the Bible but what would have to be rejected, seeing that they have been more or less connected with erroneous doctrine.

All organized religious bodies have more or less of error, as is evidenced by *the diversity* existing—no two exactly agreeing in all things. Even such an ultra sect as Mormonism has some truth obtained by its eclecticism, and no one dreams of rejecting the truth because allied with their distinctive tenets. It is deemed proper to present this Prop. in connection for two reasons: (1) it is a continuation of the history of Chiliasm as adopted, in part or whole, and incorporated in the belief of various bodies present and past; (2) it may serve to remove unnecessary prejudice, and place Chiliasm in its proper position, viz., that of a doctrine which can be received by all denominations without interfering with their distinctive denominational characteristics. We have already shown that multitudes who are as widely removed as possible from all fanaticism and extravagance, who are honored by the Church as pious and able men of God, have no affiliation with others, who endeavor to impress other doctrines, held to be erroneous, in connection with Chiliasm or some of its features. The space given to those mentioned here is necessary, because they are more or less met with, and a knowledge of them may remove prejudice.

Obs. 1. The Christadelphians, owing to a union of Pre-Millenarian views with other doctrines, are seriously injuring the former in the estimation of others because of the latter. Wherever they find a lodgment, their hostile attitude toward, and denunciations of all others, directs attention to their opinions, and in the feeling of opposition and repulsion excited against them, our doctrines being supposed to belong to them distinctively and exclusively, suffer an unjust condemnation. A little reflection ought to convince any one, even from *an historical position,* that this conclusion is highly erroneous. Christadelphianism is very modern; its founder, Dr. Thomas, only died a few years ago. It is impossible in the history of the Church (with which Jesus promised to be continuously from His First Advent) to find any writer or any document which brings forth *the Christadelphian faith* as exhibited by Dr. Thomas and his followers. The shielding of themselves under the plea that they have no creed, that the Bible is their creed, and hence nothing but the Bible is required, does not meet the case, for *nowhere* do we find the formulated statements of belief, which they assert as essential to salvation and to constitute a Christadelphian, until we come to Dr. Thomas. Surely a faith so essential as asserted, ought in the history of the Church for eighteen centuries have found some one to formulate it sufficiently indicative of its existence. Pre-Millenarian-

ism, on the other hand, is found *prominently* in the Primitive Church, and has a history to sustain it as a Church faith centuries before Dr. Thomas lived. Even in the discussion of the doctrine of the Kingdom, no acknowledgments are made of the previous holding of the truth by a line of positive witnesses, but the impression is made, designedly or undesignedly, that Dr. Thomas by his superior enlightenment presented the doctrine after it had been totally ignored by all others.[1]

Pre-Millenarians are to be found in the early Church, and in all Protestant denominations, whereas Christadelphianism is a small body with a system of formulated (i.e. as given by writers) doctrines which must be held as essential to salvation. Jesus, the Christ, is not "very God," but only inhabited by the Father through the Spirit (and even that was only accomplished at His baptism); the Holy Spirit is only the instrumental power of the Father; while the devil is only a personification of sin in the flesh (so that was a striking illustration, when they went into the swine). Unable to explain the union of spirit, soul, and body in man, they dogmatically explain all that refers to the personality of the Deity, of Satan, etc., and those who may differ from them are stigmatized as "ignorant," "errorists," "unbelievers," etc. Baptism is so completely hedged around by a series of doctrines, including *the grossest materialism*, that whosoever does not believe their *precise* system of theology cannot be baptized, and consequently will *inevitably* be damned. As their system of faith embraces a variety of features, and is complicated, taking days of patient study to understand, an unbeliever naturally feels surprise that such large numbers could be converted and baptized in one day by the Primitive Church, and that Philip so hastily baptized the eunuch, etc. Such facts, however, have no weight with them, for their distinctive faith and baptism are made *essential* unto salvation, and by this exclusiveness they debar all others, asserting it boldly and arrogantly.[2]

The grossest materialism, such as the wildest unbelief has suggested, is characteristic of the system, so that soul and body are material, or rather the former is a simple product of the latter and dies with it. Such passages as Matt. 10 : 28, Stephen's prayer, etc., cannot repress the extreme dogmatism expressed. The logical outgrowth of the whole is found in the horrible doctrine that infants and little children utterly perish by death; that the heathen and infants, at least, will never be raised from the dead.[3] Pre-Millenarians, whatever their private views may be respecting immortality (either natural or acquired) and the ultimate destiny of the wicked (either preserved in positive punishment or given over to ultimate destruction), do not put forward such unbelieving materialism, which neutralizes a class of passages indicative of the soul being something higher and nobler than the body. They do not regard the belief, one way or the other conscientiously held as essential to salvation, for they elevate neither ordinance nor doctrine to the level of a faith appropriating, even amid weakness and imperfect knowledge, Jesus as the Saviour who died for us, and our obedience sincerely rendered to Him according to the knowledge imparted.[4]

The intense and selfish bigotry actuating this body is a sad commentary on human infirmity. Without the least compunction, all outside of themselves *are condemned;* no one can be saved but themselves. Taking no warning from Jesus' rebuke to the disciples, they denounce as worthy of damnation those who supremely love the Christ and labor—let it be in weakness—for Him; ignoring what the apostles say of charity, they elevate

knowledge—such as they possess—far above it; overlooking the caution of the Spirit, they sit in judgment over all who differ from them and threaten them with endless destruction. Let the same graces of the Spirit, which they themselves profess to possess, appear in others, and it is nothing but the workings of the flesh; let the Church of the past be appealed to, its martyrs, its confessors, its missionaries, its eminent and noble men, and if not Christadelphians their love, sacrifices, toil, life, etc., are nothing but the developments of the flesh; let them be reminded that weak brethren with imperfect knowledge may exist—that men may through lack of proper understanding build imperfectly on the foundation and suffer great loss and yet be saved—that such a diversity may exist so that some are fed on "milk" and others on "strong meat"—it is nothing except they be Christadelphians. An unchristian spirit, an imprudent and arrogant claim of superior holiness and special enlightenment, cannot be pressed beyond this one. Now Pre-Millenarianism from the Primitive Church down has constantly *repudiated* such a selfish and unwarranted attitude. Its writers, numbering hundreds, scorn such an uncharitable manifestation.[5]

[1] The proof is found in Dr. Thomas's works, as e.g. in condemning and anathematizing Pre-Millenarians of all classes as unbelievers, unworthy of a following, etc., and the utter inability of pointing to a single writer preceding himself who interprets and applies the Scriptures as himself, and in the apparent boasting manner by which he elevates himself to the position of an expositor whose dicta must be followed on pain of condemnation. No works have ever been published *so dogmatical and uncharitable* as those of Dr. Thomas. The spirit is like the exclusive spirit of Mohammedanism, and the interpretation is almost as great. He is like Abd-el-Latesf (Palgrave's *Travels—Library Notes*, p. 382), whose one sect, out of seventy-three, alone could be saved. When Michael did not rail against Satan, he complacently designates Protestantism in all its forms "the Accursed Hierarchy of Satan."

[2] So precise and determined is their faith, that *the least variation* inevitably causes a division. Hence wherever they have obtained a footing and increased in numbers, they have almost invariably divided into separate parties. As no liberty is allowed, any deviation is at once denounced, and its adherents repudiated as anti-Christian. In the city of the writer it has happened that when they numbered forty or fifty they divided into two or more parties, and became exceedingly embittered against each other. Such fruit must be anticipated.

[3] In reference to Jesus saying to the children, Matt. 19 : 13, 14, etc., they give two interpretations to avoid its force. One, as given in "the Declaration of Principles," is that "the little children" denotes "believers" who are so called. A prominent Christadelphian (Dr. Reeves), to whom the writer referred this passage, repudiated, in view of Christ's actually blessing little children, this application as "childish," and stated that Jesus simply meant that little children should not be forbidden to come to Him in order that He might heal them of their diseases, for of such children some would become believers. Having hewed out a system of resurrection to suit their materialistic scheme, any passages that seem to conflict (as e.g. Rev. 20 : 12, 13; John 5 : 28, 29, etc.) must be so shaped as to accommodate themselves to it. To get rid of Rev. 20 : 5, they reject it as unscriptural because one ancient MSS. by a mere error (Tischendorf's N. Test. *loci*) omitted it, forgetting that all the other ancient MSS. have it, and that it is quoted and indorsed as existing in Scripture by writers still more ancient than any of our MSS.

[4] With the strongest materialistic notions are combined the most spiritualistic conceptions. Thus e.g. according to their tenets, they adopt in full the Universalist conception that Satan, or Devil, is in all instances merely "a personification of sin in the flesh." Because the word is used in Scripture to denote an adversary, slanderer, false accuser, etc., and is thus applied to persons, they conclude that it must in all cases have the same meaning, simply indicative of sin, or a carnal mind, as manifested in the individual, society, nation, and world. The inconsistency of pushing this to an extreme is evidenced when they come to explain how the devils entered into the swine, how proposal and rejection is presented in the temptation of Jesus, how devils are spoken of as separate and distinct from men, how Satan is described as an accountable agent who will be punished, how not only activity but attributes and passions (as faith, fear, etc.) are ascribed

to him indicative of personality and intelligence, how they spoke and acted in demoniacs, how the Jews had their views confirmed by the words of Jesus, how the early Church received their impressions from the first preachers, etc. Admitting its figurative application at times does not, by any means, force us to their conclusions. The plain grammatical sense so often presented urges us to a belief in sympathy with the Primitive Church.

[5] The charitable and Christian spirit exhibited by Pre-Millenarians was illustrated in the recent Prophetic Conference held in Dr. Tyng's church in New York, in which over three hundred ministers and numerous laymen, *representatives of the various Protestant denominations*, participated. The same has been witnessed in prophetic conferences in England. Pre-Millenarians are found in all Protestant denominations, and do not form a party, sect, or denomination *separate and distinct* from all others. They are a unit on the grand outlines of the system of belief (such as the Pre-Mill., Sec. Advent, the first and second resurrection, the translation, the judgment, the future Kingdom of the Messiah, etc.), while they may differ from each other in the details, the order of events, or in reference to other doctrines not directly associated with Pre-Millenarianism.

Obs. 2. The Seventh-Day Adventists uniting the doctrine of the nearness of the Second Advent with their peculiar, distinctive views, injure it in the minds of those who overlook the fact, that no sect has ever existed which has not mingled some truth with its error. Pre-Millenarianism especially is thus judged by the prejudice engendered by Seventh-Day Adventists, when the truth is, that so little of our doctrine is entertained by them, and so hostile are they to our essential views, that they cannot be classed with Pre-Millenarians, since they do not *in any sense* hold to a Millennium here on the earth during the thousand years. This is seen in the restoration of an old monkish idea,[1] that during the 1000 years or Millennium, this earth is to be a fiery hell in which the wicked, the mortal race, and all things are to be destroyed, and then at the end of the thousand years Jesus, the Christ, and His saints, who during the 1000 years were in the third heaven and reigned there, return to this earth which has been renewed.[2]

This organization is of very modern growth; its founders and leaders, Mrs. White and her husband, are still living. Ecclesiastical history records the existence of no body like them, with their peculiar formulated faith (as presented by their writers), although it gives persons and parties who arose now and then, and insisted upon the observance of the Seventh Day. Their system, like Mormonism, is eclectic, and a variety of doctrines are incorporated, such as a gross materialism as taught by the Storrites and Christadelphians, a speedy Advent with the exegesis attached to it as presented by the Millerites, a non-perpetuation of the race, and a non-restoration of the Jews as taught by some of the Sec. Adventists, a denial of the unchangeable priesthood of Jesus, co-existent with His own existence, as affirmed by Post-Millenarians, a special adherence to the doctrine of meats and drinks (e.g. pork, coffee and tea) as illustrated by the Jews, a lack of charity toward all who refuse to receive their system of faith, hedged in by a declarative baptism, as in turn enforced against them by various other sects in a spirit of exclusiveness. They claim for themselves a particular mission (as we shall show) and introduce things in support of it not only new but astounding, as shown in the wonderful interpretations given to prophetic Scripture in support of their *special* claims as God's people. Ignoring the everlasting Davidic Covenant in its plain grammatical sense, and the prophecies in vindication of the same, they spiritualize the same, and hence have *no correct conceptions* of the Theocratic Kingdom. Their theory makes it a purely spiritual Kingdom—like that of Post-Millenarians. They have but little in common with Pre-Millenarians.[3]

The prophetism of Mrs. White is highly objectionable, because *the falsity* of her alleged ability to prophecy is made palpably evident by her interpretation and application of Scripture, thus showing that her predictions are only the result *of her own imaginings*, probably of a diseased mind strongly affected by religious ideas.[4] One illustration of her interpretation under prophetic influence will suffice, and this is selected because it serves to show both her mission (and that of her followers), and the manner in which all things must be bent to subserve the Seventh-Day interest. Let the reader turn to Rev. 14, and she has *the audacity* to claim that the Seventh-Day Adventists at present compose those 144,000 thousand. That, which so many interpreters apply to the glorified saints, they refer *to themselves* in their present mortal and imperfect state. Surely the pride that can thus *exclusively* appropriate this select band with its new song and distinguishing blessings *to one sect*, is not to be envied. She violates the conspicuous contrast presented by the "first-fruits" as a part previously taken away from "the harvest" that follows, making their sect continuous down and preparative in effect, to the harvest; and she destroys the order of the fulfilment in making such an arrogant claim, because she makes the first angel message to symbolize the Millerites and the third angel message to denote the special mission of the Seventh-Day Adventists, thus virtually making —if the order is to be followed—the Millerites to follow chronologically after the rise of the Seventh-Day Adventists (which is not the fact) and thus assuming that the 144,000 are identical with the party symbolized by the third angel. The entire interpretation of the passage and its connections is so formed as to exalt the Seventh-Day Adventists and the Seventh Day.[5]

Adventism is linked with the Seventh Day, the latter being regarded as essential to the former (hence the name) for they declare that if the assumed truth of the Seventh Day is presented to any one and he rejects it, then there is no salvation for him, although he may otherwise bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.[6] In view of this connection it is, probably, advisable to consider, briefly, this Seventh-Day question. The line of argument adopted by them is exceedingly plausible, and most admirably adapted to impress the unwary and ignorant. Indeed, since many who oppose them admit some of their premises, they cannot logically or consistently meet them in a discussion without defeat. They assert the following: that the Seventh Day alone was instituted as a Sabbath; that this was incorporated in the ten commandments; that these commandments were never abrogated, and hence are binding upon us; that Jesus only kept the Seventh Day, and we are exhorted to follow His example; that unless we keep the ten commandments as given we have no right to enter the New Jerusalem; that the New Test. contains no passage affirming a change to be made from the seventh day to the first; and that the change from the seventh day to the first is due to the Papacy. These are the salient points urged by them. Now the only position from which they can be met, is the one occupied by the Reformers. The Sabbath, i.e., the Seventh Day, or day of rest instituted at creation, was incorporated directly in the Theocratic government established at Mt. Sinai, and was made obligatory upon the Jewish nation; it was kept down to the day of Pentecost when the Christian Church was erected, and partly down to the destruction of Jerusalem by Jewish converts; Jesus as a minister of the circumcision and to qualify himself for His work by obedience, had to keep

this commandment; but the death of Jesus, His sacrifice, abrogated the entire Mosaic law as given to the Jewish nation, and this included the ten commandments in the form presented to that nation; but as the ten commandments contain moral duties which are eternal as to their nature, we have these fully repeated and inculcated in the New Test. writings given after the sacrifice of Jesus; nine of the commandments are thus directly enforced, but the one respecting the keeping of the Seventh Day is *not repeated.* If the keeping of that special day is so essential as the Seventh-Day Adventists affirm, surely it is excessively strange that so remarkable, so striking *an omission* has occurred.[7] On the other hand we have positive assertions which show that the omission is designedly done, and that we are no longer bound by the Seventh Day observance, as found in Col. 2 : 16; Rom. 14 : 5–6; Gal. 4 : 10.[8] The question then may be asked, Why was Sunday substituted for the Seventh Day as a day of public worship? The answer is found in this: worship, and the assembling of ourselves together for public worship, is required; a time must be set aside for its observance. This was done *in the Apostolic age and under Apostolic sanction,* and was perpetuated. Ecclesiastical history shows that down to the destruction of Jerusalem (which demonstrated the removal of the Mosaic observances) the Jewish congregations observed the seventh and the first day; the Gentiles observed the first day, and this latter became *the universal custom*—a custom which God has signally blessed in the conversion, spiritual improvement, etc. of multitudes of believers.[9]

They elevate the observance of a day to an essential of salvation, making it virtually as requisite as the reception of the blood of Christ, and the favorite passage levelled—by perversion—at the observers of the first day or Sunday is Rev. 22 : 14. Allowing the text to stand as it is in our version (for the Sinaitic MSS. reads "are they that wash their robes," Tischendorf's *N. T.*), a sufficient reply is found in John 14 : 15, 21, 23, and 15 : 10. If they can point to a commandment given by Jesus or His inspired Apostles in His name, to keep the Seventh Day, then their bigoted and spiritually proved interpretation might hold good.

[1] In the Fourth B. of Esdras, an apocryphal writing, we have such a state of desolation for seven days; this they extend to one thousand years. In the opinion of the monk, specified under another proposition, this state embraces a thousand years. The early Church taught the contrary, abiding by covenant and prophecy.

[2] The eternal hell on earth of Edwards (*His. of Redemp.*) they reduce to the thousand years; and the Post-Mill. reign of Jesus and the saints in the third heaven they limit to the thousand years in the same place. A passage proving such *a return* of Jesus and His saints to the third heaven after His Sec. Advent, and a passage proving such a reign of theirs *in the third heaven,* and a passage teaching *their return* to the earth after a thousand years, they cannot produce, but build entirely upon *inference* and *the assumed* inspiration of their prophetess, Mrs. White. It is a theory so flatly contradicted by sound exegesis, that it is a matter of amazement that it should be entertained. It overrides all logical connection of prophecy. Thus, to illustrate: they very eagerly quote Zech. 14 : 4, 5 as having reference to the Sec. Advent, but wrest it from its connection and make it fit into their assumption, notwithstanding the immediate context shows a reign upon the earth as following, the restoration of the Jews and Millennial blessedness on the earth as succeeding such an Advent, *without the interposition of a thousand years,* which, according to their theory, would make an end of the Jewish nation in the flesh, and of all other nations, and thus render the fulfilment an impossibility.

[3] We do not, on this ground, affirm that they are no Christians. They have among them pious and devoted persons, who conscientiously hold to their doctrines and labor for their dissemination. Being for the Christ, doing much for the love of Him, we cannot, and do not, reject them. Their doctrines are *public* and challenge our attention,

and consequently they cannot censure us, if conscientiously and with the inalienable liberty of "private judgment," we thus find fault with them.

[4] Charity causes us to adopt this opinion in order that her sincerity and conscientiousness may not be questioned. History in the past shows us that many—just as Mormonism and others at present—in the past have set up, in support of their doctrines, the claim of being prophets. When tested by the Scriptures, their *palpable antagonism* to some of its teachings and their *misapprehension* of its predictions and promises, show us that their pretension to be under *the special* enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit *cannot be admitted.* We know Mrs. White only from her writings, and these are *amply sufficient* to set aside her prophetism. In the first edition of her prophecies, nearly an entire volume is taken up with disputes concerning herself, and with affidavits respecting her moral character, which, to say the least, were *in exceeding bad taste,* and which, consequently, are omitted in the later republication. It is a matter of amazement that so many persons, with the repeated warnings of history before them and with her own assertions to compare with the Scriptures, can be led to follow her and adopt her hallucinations. Those that I have come in contact with affirm that she has shown her union with the special supernatural gift by being able to see things transpiring at a distance. Surely if that is a test, then Swedenborg and many others, who *far exceed her* in such proofs, ought, with their teaching, to be received in preference to her; the claims of Romish saints, of Mormon prophets, etc., are not a whit more arbitrary and unsatisfactory than Mrs. White's. History is constantly repeating itself, and evidencing how easily human nature is deceived. Mrs. White might be profited by studying the claims of Jane Leade, Mother Lee, and many others.

[5] That the reader may observe this still more clearly we append a brief epitome of the connected application, which, perhaps, for ignorance and audacity stands unsurpassed. The 144,000 are the Seventh-Day Baptists; the first angel message represents the Millerite proclamation; the third angel message again symbolizes the mission of the Seventh-Day body. Then follows: this body sounds the alarm that the first beast is the Papacy, which established Sunday instead of the seventh day; the second beast is the United States (!), which worships the first beast and makes an image to him by adopting Sunday; the seal of the angel is the commandment to keep the Sabbath or seventh day; the mark of the beast is Sunday-keeping; the mark in the forehead is thinking of and defending the same; the mark in the hand is resting on that day, etc. Can anything *more childish and extravagant* be foisted on prophecy; and yet it is sad to think that persons, intelligent to a great degree, adopt such *extreme* views, and go around the country to defend them.

[6] This is publicly preached as a logical result of their system. Elders Waggoner and Stone, who proclaimed this at Springfield, O., had, however, the charity to say that those who were ignorant, who had had no access to the truth as possessed by them, might be saved; but if you once heard their vagaries and Mrs. White's alleged prophetism (which as a body they adopt) and rejected them, the door of salvation was shut!

[7] The critical student will not fail to notice that both the Sabbatarians (i.e. those who hold to the premise that the ten commandments are binding in the Theocratic form given) and the Seventh-Day Adventists are in the same quandary precisely. The latter triumphantly point out these admissions (respecting the binding nature of the ten commandments as given), and then ask for a Scriptural proof—a thus saith the Lord—for a change from the seventh day to the first. To this no Scriptural reply can be given, excepting through sheer inference. But the triumph of the Seventh-Day Adventist is premature as against us, for denying the premise, in which we are supported by the abundant declarations of the Apostles, we ask them to show a Scriptural proof that at the establishment of the Christian Church, and afterward, *a command was given* by inspiration to keep the seventh day. The Sabbatarians fail in their proof, but in precisely the like manner do the Seventh-Day Adventists. And yet they proceed in pushing their theory to an extreme, as if they had *express* warrant to do so from Jesus and His Apostles. It is another verification of Thucydides' assertion, "that ignorance is bold and knowledge reserved," which may, as Eccl. History shows, be extended into this, that ignorance is condemnatory and denunciatory, while knowledge is charitable and indulgent. The reader will observe that our remarks apply only to such who receive the Holy Scriptures, and who unchristianize others who refuse to receive their interpretation of the same, although they may bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.

[8] The exegesis given by them of Col. 2 : 16 is exceedingly weak, based on the idea of "a shadow of things to come," asserting (1) that the Sabbaths alluded to were the Jubilee Sabbath, etc., and not the ordinary Sabbath, and (2) that the seventh day was not used

as a type. To this we reply : (1) that the plural form includes all ; (2) that the Colossians would be better acquainted with the ordinary than with the extraordinary Sabbath, and if Paul desired the observance of one out of the number, he ought to have made the distinction ; (3) that the ordinary Sabbath is used as a type in Heb., being the very day on which God rested. The other passages positively forbid that which is the distinguishing characteristic of the Seventh-Day Adventists, viz., a species of "will-worship" in affected humility, evidencing itself in a self-imposed superiority over all others.

[9] To indicate the lack of candor in their advocates, we present the following illustration : Elder Waggoner (July, 1878) publicly declared in Springfield, O. (what their books repeat), that Sunday was made into a Sabbath by Constantine in the fourth century, and that we are indebted *to the Papacy* for the substitution, thus leaving the impression (1) that *previous* to that time the seventh day was observed by the Church, and (2) that Constantine and the Papacy *first* introduced the change. This is *utterly false*, a slander upon observers of the first day, and although the proof was pointed out to this elder, he and his coadjutors go on repeating the falsehood in behalf of their system. The truth, as attested to by history, is this : In the union of state and Church instituted by Constantine (and which all good men must deplore, in view of the results), he made numerous decrees regulating the Church (incorporating truths which Waggoner also holds), and among others pertaining to Sunday, but he accepted in the latter what was *already an established fact* in the Church. The proof that the Church universally held to the first day as the day of public worship is found in Justin Martyr's *Apology*, presented to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, A.D. 150, where, giving an account of the public worship of Christians, he says : "On the day which is called Sunday, *all*, whether dwelling in the towns or in the villages, hold meetings ; and the Memoirs of the Apostles, and the writings of the prophets, are read," etc. "We *all* commonly hold our assemblies on Sunday, because it is the first day on which God converted the darkness and matter, and framed the world ; and Jesus Christ our Saviour, on the same day, arose from the dead." Barnabas of the first century (quoted by Neander, *Ch. His.*) makes the same statement and assigns the same reason. (If Barnabas be a Jewish-Christian, and not Barnabas who was with Paul, it only serves to show how Jewish believers regarded the first day.) Now here is an apology, written by the most distinguished man of the second century, flatly and fully contradicting Waggoner's statements. When pressed on this point, and to adduce proof on his side equally satisfactory historically, the reply was that the pious and devoted ones had no time to write, or, if they had written, the writings were destroyed.

Obs. 3. "Millerism" is most frequently associated with Pre-Millenarianism, when the simple truth is this : it has more points of association in belief with Post-Millenarianism than with Chiliasm. The proof is found in the doctrines proclaimed, as e.g. they agree with Post-Mills. in ignoring the Davidic Covenant, in denying the restoration of the Jews and the same Davidic Kingdom overthrown, in not discriminating between the first and second resurrection, in refusing the perpetuation of the race after the Advent, in holding to the dissolution of the earth, in the views of judgment, the Judgment Day, the world to come, etc. The only points of contact between Millerism and Pre-Millenarianism are the nearness of the Sec. Advent, and the duty of constant watchfulness. It evidently had pious and sincere advocates, and is not characterized by that intense exclusiveism and bigotry, observed in those preceding. But the idea of a blessed Millennial age over the spared nations of the earth under the personal reign of Jesus and His saints, was not entertained, the Popish views of Eschatology being generally retained, just as they exist prevailing in the churches of today. According to their doctrinal position, they cannot be called Millenarians, because the Sec. Advent was "a winding up of all sublunary affairs."

Notwithstanding the essential difference between Millenarianism and Millerism, men will persistently and unjustly class them together. An illustration is given in the N. Y. *Independent* (Dec., 1878) by Prof. Norman Fox, who classes the members of "the Proph.

Conference" (1878) with "Millerism," and then adds: "The history of Millerism shows that this (the nearness of the Advent) is a dangerous doctrine, except to some strong-natured men, who are able to quaff the sparkling wine of this glowing conception; tending to throw the shallower-headed brother off his balance, and leave the broken-down disciple shrieking in a madhouse in the delirium tremens of the doctrine of an impending Advent." Surprising that a believer in the Bible should thus speak of "*the Blessed Hope*," and thus caricature the most eminent and pious men that lived in the Church, and overlook the important fact that the elements that unhinged some of the Millerites were precisely those of judgment and the universal destruction of the earth, as probably held by Fox himself and related to that Advent. The Popish ideas, pertaining to Eschatology and to the Advent, have more largely influenced those who unfortunately were weak-minded than ever the Pre-Millenarian; for the latter holds forth the Sec. Advent as a source of joy and blessedness to the believer, and not one of terror and consternation. Some few, to indicate their scorn of Pre-Millenarianism speak of it, by allying it with "Millerism," as if it sprung from the same, thus exhibiting either their ignorance or malice, seeing that the former is ancient and that the latter, like Whitbyism, is modern. "Millerism" was connected with "time," i.e. the exact period of the Sec. Advent was diligently sought and definitely fixed.

Obs. 4. "Second Adventism" is the outgrowth of "Millerism," and is far more systematic in its statements, and contains more scriptural truth relating to Eschatology. But strictly they cannot be called Pre-Millenarian. They have more views in common with us, but on *the essential points* of a Millennial Messianic Kingdom over the Jewish nation and spared Gentile nations under the personal reign of Jesus and His saints, they are defective (some, however, are coming closer and closer to us in doctrine). In the art. "Second Advent Believers" (Rupp's *Orig. His. Relig. Denominations*), written by a "Second Adventist" (N. Southard, editor of the *Midnight Cry*) it is seen that Millenarianism as held by the Primitive Church and by many eminent men in various denominations, is not taught by them. The Scriptures relating to the Millennium they either make conditional, or locate them after an Advent which ends this world by a universal conflagration. The new creation that they advocate, and the reign of Christ and His saints in it, is equivalent to that taught by many Post-Millenarians. While they discriminate more in the doctrine and order of the resurrection, insist upon the speedy Advent, the non-conversion of the world prior to the Advent, the restitution of the earth to its paradisaical state, its ultimate possession by Christ and the saints, they omit *vital doctrines* which would, strictly, mark them as Pre-Millenarian, viz., they reject the future literal fulfilment of the Davidic Covenant upon which the future Messianic Kingdom is based; they deny the restoration of the Jews and the prophecies relating to them (applying the latter just as Post-Millenarians); they refuse the perpetuation of the race after the Second Advent, thus making a Millennium as described impossible; they largely incorporate the Romish (but now prevailing views) ideas of the judgment, Judgment Day and its accessories, etc. (compare arts. on, in Buck's *Theol. Dic.;* M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, etc.). They are earnest, pious, and devoted; numbering, perhaps, near thirty thousand. They have some excellent writers, who have done good service in presenting doctrines essential to the Chiliastic system, and they are not characterized by a spirit of exclusiveism and lack of charity, but cordially recognize as brethren all who love Jesus and His appearing.

As a marked illustration of the difference between "Second Adventism" and "Pre-Millenarianism," we direct attention to Rev. Litch's *Discussion on the Millennium* (Boston, 1874), which is a reply to Rev. Dr. Brown's work against us. Dr. Brown has *nine* points

against us ; Rev. Litch agrees with Brown in *seven* of them, and therefore only opposes two out of the nine. He disagrees with Brown as to the time of the Advent and reign, and concerning the time and order of the resurrection, but agrees with him *in limiting* the mediatorial work to this dispensation ; in making no salvation possible *after* this age ; in removing *the priesthood* from Jesus ; in giving up *the race* to ultimate destruction ; in *denying* the oath-bound Davidic covenant to be realized, unless spiritually ; in advocating a universal conflagration which destroys *all things ;* in rejecting *the restoration* of the Jews ; in not allowing a reign *over mortal men* in the flesh, etc. The fact is, that they are in sympathy *in more points* of doctrine with Post-Millenarians than with us, as this reply evidences. Still on cardinal points, which Post-Millenarians bitterly oppose, they are in unison with our views, and the prominency of the latter brings them more distinctly before the public. Many of them were formerly "timists," but a large number have succeeded in making the chronological question merely approximative and subsidiary.

Obs. 5. A number of small bodies, that may be illustrated as follows : "Storrites" or "Destructionists" (the followers of Storrs, who publishes a paper in New York), which is a mingling of Materialism and Second Adventism, the complete and final destruction of the wicked being the leading characteristic of their faith. "One-Faith People" being a mixture, as far as we can understand them, of Storrism, Sec. Adventism, Christadelphianism, etc. "Barbourism" or "Restitutionists" (the followers of Barbour, who published the *Three Worlds*, etc.) which is a revival, in part, of Rellyism (see preceding Prop. and note), for the ultimate restoration of the wicked is advocated by pressing "all things" to an extreme, and rejecting the general analogy of Scripture in behalf of a few passages which are susceptible of a different explanation. "The No-Age People," some of whom are connected with these and others, while others stand independent and prefer to be thus designated. They are characterized by two peculiarities, viz., materialistic views, and a denial that the Sec. Advent is to be succeeded by an age to come. All these ignore the fundamental positions upon which Pre-Millenarianism rests, viz., the Davidic Covenant and the resultant Messianic Kingdom, making it (excepting, I believe, "the One-Faith People") a purely spiritual Kingdom, very different from the one covenanted. The Gnostic, mystical, spiritualistic reasons assigned for such a view have been and will be noticed and answered under previous and following Props. The distinctive peculiarities associated with some of our views, make the whole subject to be ignored by many, who either are incapable, or refuse, to distinguish. Amiable, sincere, and pious men are connected with these, as is evidenced by their writings.

It is difficult to keep track of the divisions of these small parties. Thus e.g. Russell, of Pittsburg, Pa., who was at one time a colaborer of Barbour's (Rochester, N. Y.), separated from him and is at the head of another party : even this is again subdivided by the withdrawal of Jones and others. Parties arise on all sides, fulfilling the predictions of the Saviour. Thus e.g. we have Groves and Goodnight, two Cumberland Presbyterian ministers (as reported by *Luth. Observer*, Sept. 19th, 1879), who professed to have "received a special divine revelation, in which the end of the world within ten years was foretold." Expelled by the Presbytery, they started a new sect, called "The Tabernacle of the Coming Lord" (thus, in the title assumed, evidencing their ignorance of *the covenanted tabernacle* of the Coming Lord). They cannot be successful, seeing that they have exhibited themselves as false prophets, if the editor reports them correctly, as follows : "Among their other vagaries, they prophesy that General Grant will be re-elected President in 1880, and will then invade and conquer Europe, overthrow Romanism, and finally meet with a downfall—after which the Millennium will be ushered in." Other small parties have fallen under our notice, and it is a peculiarity with them all that they lay claim to a very special spiritual enlightenment, and are, more or less, condemnatory of all who do not receive their expressed tenets of faith.

Obs. 6. Chiliasm is frequently allied with the following: "The Anabaptists" at the time of the Reformation. But a reference to their doctrines shows conclusively that they are *far more* in sympathy and unity with the Post-Millenarian view than with ours, because they believed, as the Whitbyans do, that *they themselves*, without the Second Advent and *prior to* the res. of the saints, could introduce the promised Mill. glory. A candid perusal of Mosheim, Kurtz, Neander, Hase, Gieseler, and other Ch. historians (comp. e.g. Dorner's *His. Prot. Theol.;* Lord's *Apoc.*, arts. in *Encyclops.*, etc.), will show that they sought, by arms and force, to secure the supreme power and install themselves in the government of the earth, making the Church under themselves the covenanted and predicted Messianic Kingdom. Their views are *in direct antagonism* to Millenarianism, and to associate us with them is to manifest either ignorance of Church history or malice. "The Fifth-Monarchy Men," that arose later in England, entertained precisely similar views, believing that they themselves were called—without a prior Advent or res.—to set up the Fifth Universal Monarchy predicted by Dan. (comp. Hists. of England, Hume's, Pictorial, Burnet, etc., etc., and arts. on, in *Cyclops.*). What Millenarians attribute to Christ's Coming and His reign (and that of the saints), they, like Post-Millenarians—thought they could perform, or the Church through them. The only difference between Whitbyanism and these two classes mentioned —we admit a great one—is this, that the former seeks to gain its dream of conquest through moral and spiritual means, while the latter invoked violent measures to aid them. The dream, however, is common to both, making a Millennium *without Christ* a possibility.

It is but just to say (comp. arts. in Appletons' *Cyclop., Encyclop. Relig. Knowledge,* etc.) that not all Anabaptists must be classed with these fanatical ones; we must distinguish, *in common justice,* between the extravagant party and the more moderate one. See a fair and impartial statement of the forerunners and immediate causes of this Anabaptist movement as given by Seebohm in *The Era of the Protestant Revolution.* According to Robertson's *Middle Ages* and numerous writers, these fanatics, who strove to reinstate "the throne of David" and have John Boccold "King of Zion," were guilty of the most heinous crimes. Now to link, as many do, Millenarians, including the purest and noblest men in the Church, with such *bloody and blasphemous* men, is evidence of a malicious, slanderous disposition. This, however, is sometimes done by mistake, being repeated from others without adequate knowledge of the facts. In reference to the Fifth-Monarchy men, of whom Evelyn (*Diary,* vol. 1, p. 339) says that they "pretended to set up the Kingdom of Christ with the sword," we present an illustration of careless historical statement, and a lack of doctrinal discrimination, afforded by Neal in his *His. of the Puritans* (vol. 2, p. 220-21). Speaking of the Fifth-Monarchy men, he correctly represents them as considering themselves commissioned to introduce a universal Kingdom. He informs us that the Congregationalists and Baptists drew up declarations against them, and asserts: "They disown the principles of a Fifth Monarchy, or the personal reign of King Jesus on earth as dishonorable to Him." Neal gives us his own impressions, or that of Anti-Millenarians, for *the facts* are that while they disowned the principles, manner of propagation, and rebellion of the Fifth-Monarchy men, they did not deny the universal Kingdom still future or the personal reign of Jesus. The proof is overwhelming; for a single glance at the Confession of John Bunyan and other Baptists (which we quote), and the known Millenarian position of ministers whom he names (and we also quote), shows that they could not possibly make the declaration assigned to them.

Hatred or ignorance sometimes allies Pre-Mill. with Shakerism (this is noticed in preceding Prop.) or with Mormonism (this is observed in preceding Prop.), or with the "Camisards" or "the French Prophets" (see arts. on, in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, the *Ency. Relig. Knowl.*, etc.). Of the latter it may be said that, under the profession of an abounding "Baptism of the Spirit," resulting in miraculous endowments, they hoped to become the instruments of introducing the predicted Mill. glory by signs, wonders, judgments, etc. Both Millenarians and Post-Millenarians objected to their extravagances

and fanaticism, and they soon came to an end. Malice has again recently allied us with Mormonism ; and if the principle is a just one, how few would escape such a connection, seeing that many doctrines are held by them common to nearly all, if not all. The fact is, they are more in sympathy with the spirit of Post-Mill. than with ours, as e.g. illustrated in the profession, that "the Church of the Latter-Day Saints is the Stone foretold by Daniel to smite the Image ;" or in Miss Eliza R. Snow's poem, "Our Prophet, Brigham Young," saying :

"Help him to found thy kingdom
In majesty and power," etc.

Obs. 7. We mention two bodies with reluctance, because they contain eminently pious and able men, and yet in view of the direct prominency given to Chiliastic views in connection with doctrines that are regarded as erroneous by the large majority of Protestant denominations, they prejudice many against the truth. The "Catholic Apostolic Church" (the offshoot of Irvingism) is Chiliastic, but in connection has an extreme hierarchical and liturgical formalism, having revived (as the Mormons) the Apostolate, and claims the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit perpetuated in their Church, thus having prophets, etc., in their midst.[1] The "Plymouth Brethren," or "Believers," or Darbyites, are just at the opposite extreme ; being noted for their absolute Independentism. While strongly Chiliastic, they prominently set forth that all clericism and ecclesiastical forms are evil—Romish and Protestant Churches alike are Babel—that there is only one office, the spiritual priesthood of all believers, and every one has a right, as the spirit moves him, to preach, administer the sacraments, discipline, etc. They also claim the special gifts of the Spirit, and have a mystical tendency.[2]

[1] This Church claims the perpetuation of the Apostolate, having twelve Apostles, who are the chief rulers. It is sufficient to say that the distinctive number of twelve, the calling by Jesus in person, the inspiration and infallibility connected with the office, the being the founders of the Church, the specific reward (Matt. 19 : 28) assigned to them indicative of a limited select body, the declaration (Rev. 21 : 14) of this continued select limited number in the future, the general sense of the Church, especially the primitive, on the subject—these considerations are ample to set aside any such *assumptions*, however sincerely maintained. All this is based upon mere inferential proof. When the Church general speaks of "apostolic men" aside from the Apostles, it simply means either men associated with the Apostles, or living in their days, or distinguished, like the Apostles, for piety and abundance of labors. The "Baptism of the Spirit," which produces such abundant fruitage, will be noticed under Prop. 171. Another point may be adduced : Rev. Andrews, in behalf of "the Cath. Apost. Church," in stating "its relation to other churches" (*Bib. Sacra*, Ap., 1866), glowingly specifies its mission to be to restore the Church to a state of strength, faith, etc., *preparatory* to the Sec. Advent. But this is (1) to ignore positive prediction that it will not be accomplished ; (2) to reverse prediction, which places the awakening and faith to be after the secret stage of the Advent, the resurrection and translation ; and (3) to exalt this organization as a preparative of the Coming, when that Coming depends on the completed number of the first-fruits gathered out from all denominations, and many gathered out before it had any existence. The tendency of all such departures is specially to exalt their own mission, thus apologizing in behalf of their special claims.

[2] The principles are disintegrating, and have a decided tendency to alienate any person adopting them from his denomination ; indeed, in their published works, the advice of withdrawal is boldly given as an alleged Christian duty. They arrogate to themselves, and to all who really belong to the Ch. Church, the above privilege of inheriting the Kingdom, forgetting that Christians inherit *with* the ancient worthies, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The mystical views are illustrated e.g. in their writers maintaining a real, tangible impartation of the divine nature in the soul, and making this the basis of union with Christ, and hence speaking slightingly of faith. Thus Lincoln (*Lects. on Epistles of St. John*, p. 125), in his eagerness to make out this divine impartation, says : "We are not united to Christ by faith ; there is a time when faith shall not be. Do you think our

union will end then? No! it is by the Holy Ghost." (Such views are not new; they are constantly reproduced, sometimes in a higher Pantheistic form.) Now the Scriptural teaching is plain. (1) We are united to Christ by faith, as seen e.g. Eph. 3 : 7; Gal. 2 : 20; Col. 2 : 5-7, etc. (2) The Holy Spirit aids this faith, 1 Cor. 12 : 8, 9; Gal. 5 : 22, etc. (3) Faith through the aid of the Spirit applies the blood of Christ—appropriates it—hence justification, Acts 13 : 39; Rom. 3 : 22, 25, 26, 28, 30, and 15 : 1; Gal. 2 : 16, etc. (4) Faith is never done away; the realization only confirms it and increases it the more. We cannot possibly conceive of its non-existence, just as little as of the non-continuance of love, peace, or any other of the graces. (5) The Holy Spirit is in us just as Christ—His mind, principles, etc.—is in us, for the sealing of the Spirit, the fruits of the Spirit, and the earnest of the Spirit are *the same* (comp. Edwards on *The Affections*). (6) Eternal life is, indeed, a believer's (because he is justified by faith), but this life (i.e. its realization) is in Him (Jesus, the Christ), and will be revealed at His Coming through the Spirit's power of resurrection and glorification. Then there are also small bodies, as e.g. the followers of Barbour of Rochester, the followers of Russell of Pittsburg, etc., who affiliate largely with the last in their opposition to denominations, etc. According to their periodicals and tracts, their chief characteristics are in enforcing a spiritual kingdom, a future restoration of the wicked to access to forgiveness and life, the present being the season of harvest, etc. As their views are considered under various propositions, no detailed statement is necessary. To return to the "Brethren:" R. Holden (*Corinth and Sects*, p. 14) declares that a man who receives the truth and acts conscientiously cannot go into any of the churches of the various denominations to worship, for in so doing he virtually connives at schism, divisions, etc. All that we now say is this: suppose others are weak, babes, or worse, in comparison to themselves, should they not remain where they might exert a direct and healthy influence, instead of multiplying parties? And would it not be well if such zealous brethren possessed the piety, the graces, and usefulness that many in these same condemned churches manifest? Jesus Himself has cautioned us: "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." The spirit, the motive, may override knowledge.

Obs. 8. The differences between Pre-Millenarianism and Post-Millenarianism, Anti-Millenarianism, Spiritualism, are numerous in the interpretation and application of Scripture. These are pointed out in detail as we proceed, arising from the principle of interpretation adopted, and relate to the manner of understanding the Abrahamic Covenant, the Davidic, the renewal of the covenant, the inheritance of the Christ, the Pre-Mill. Advent, the non-conversion of the world before the Advent, the first and second resurrections, the Judgeship of Jesus, the Judgment Day, the world to come, the Rest, the reign of Jesus and His saints, the restoration of the Jewish nation and their supremacy, the Antichrist and results, the Theocratic Kingdom, the Supernatural introduction of the Mill. age, the perpetuity of the earth and race, the design of this dispensation, the nearness of the Advent, the commanded posture and duty of believers, the prominency of "the blessed hope," and various related subjects. Of course the correctness of belief must be decided by an appeal to Scripture, and the student must determine for himself which party obtains the strongest support from Holy Writ.

Hence the appeals to superior piety, to special enlightenment, to personal assaults, to claims of exclusiveness, are of no weight whatever in an argument or presentation of truth. The question is, What do the Scriptures teach, not inferentially or spiritually, but, directly and in their plain grammatical sense? We may say here that, judging from the writings of a number that we have mentioned under this Prop., a large part of the capital used in attempts of prophetical writing consists in the store afforded by "Babylon" and "Babel." The constant use and changes are bewildering. Here a party, with sufficient pride, self-esteem, represents itself as the only body of true believers; all outside are "Babylon" and "Babel." Another party acts similarly, and makes the other party "Babylonish." So we find body after body with this exclusive vanity painfully presented, and, in their assumed perfectibility of doctrine and knowledge, condemning

all others—no matter, if they can only trace up their origin to a brief period. Valuable truth, precious matter, is mixed up with a violence of bigotry saddening to observe. It is true that much of this defeats itself by its own extravagance, but it is also true that sincere, honest, and pious souls are entangled in its toils, deeming their position one demanded by religious principle. All these various parties and sects run the Babylonish interpretation to an extreme, and if we were to give credit to their exclusive and Pharisaic claims, we must believe that their several bodies are composed of "the pure wheat," and "tares" cannot co-exist; that martyrs, confessors, missionaries, eminent and laborious ministers, who evidenced a devoted love for Jesus, are, after all, because they did not or do not hold to the same views, nothing but "Babylonians;" that Babylon, instead of denoting a wide departure from God (as e.g. witnessed in the legislative, executive, and propagating spirit of the Papacy, nationalized churches, and others) is a complete and total corruption, never suspecting that its spirit is also manifested in their own selfishness and bigotry; that they themselves making "Babylon" to arise centuries after the First Advent, they do not make the least effort to contrast the history of the Church then with its status at present, with the legitimate conclusions derived therefrom; and that those who locate the fulfilment in the future are guilty of a singular inconsistency, viz., taking upon themselves the responsibility of calling others "out of Babylon" (by which they mean "out of all other churches"), when the fulfilment is future. We certainly locate the call in the interval (as we explain in detail under other Props.), and we regard those who, however sincere, undertake such a call, as running *before they are called*. It is passing strange that just so soon as a party deems itself the pure, unadulterated Church and meets with decided opposition, then its opposers become "Babylon," and the self-imposed, but evidently agreeable, duty is enjoined to call others out of this Babylon. Thus even the amiable Edward Irving, falling into extremes (art. on, *Princeton Review*, Ap., 1863; comp. *Life of*, by Mrs. Oliphant), finally said: "I do solemnly declare my belief that the Protestant churches are in the state of Babylon as truly as is the Romish Church. And I do separate myself, and my flock standing in me, from that Babylonish confederacy." To-day various sects exist that denounce his church and offshoots as also belonging to Babylon; but this is to be expected, seeing that they throw the Babylonian shaft at each other with such evident relish. Indeed, if this Babylonish weapon were taken from them, it would leave them in a manner defenceless, seeing that their greatest skill is manifested in its use. We hold to the present and future existence of Babylon; we regard the name as symbolic and highly expressive; we firmly believe its culmination and punishment is future (just previous to which, in the interval, the call is made), as has already been presented. Hence we cannot receive—on the other hand—that extreme view (e.g. in *Briefs on Prophetic Themes*, by a member of the Boston Bar; *Waymarks in the Wilderness*, vol. 3, No. 3, etc.), which holds that in the future the literal ancient Babylon will be rebuilt, etc. Rev. 17 and 18, compared with other Scripture, abundantly refute it. Fausset (*Ch. Herald*, Aug. 14th, 1879) more correctly makes "Babylon" to be primarily the apostate Romish Church, but adds: "Even the professing evangelical churches, so far as they contain Babylonian elements, shall share in Babylon's doom. The Church, going after the world, as if it were the reality instead of witnessing against its godlessness, is false to her profession," etc.

Obs. 9. Pre-Millenarians differ among themselves as to details, and this is seized by some opponents and paraded (as e.g. by Brown) as if fatal to the doctrine, overlooking the simple fact that no doctrine (not even baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc.) exists, to which its adherents do not give a diversity of explanation and application. The weakness and imperfection of human nature in its comprehension of truth is not to be made *the standard* by which to measure the truth itself. In the grand outlines of Millenarianism, all Pre-Millenarians are united. Thus e.g. they all hold to a future Millennial age; this age to be preceded by the personal Advent of Jesus; this Millennial period to be bounded by a literal first and second resurrection, the former at the beginning and the latter at its ending. They all believe in a still future covenanted Messianic Kingdom introduced by the Sec. Advent, the resurrection and translation of the saints, and the restoration and repentance of the Jewish nation. They all teach the same design respecting this dispensation, the non-conversion of the world before

the Sec. Advent, the same Judgeship of Jesus, the same Judgment Day, and related subjects. They differ as to the exact nature of the Kingdom, the manner and duration of the reign, the stages of the Sec. Advent, and in the interpretation and application of passages and predictions of Scripture ; and this difference arises solely from the removal of the everlasting, oath-bound covenant of David out of their system (a fundamental neglect, inevitably leading to misapprehension) and from a spiritualizing interpretation incorporated, more or less, notwithstanding the plain grammatically expressed sense.

Many who express themselves hastily or incautiously are still somewhat under the influence of the widespread spiritualistic and mystical interpretation of the Scriptures. It is reasonable to anticipate such divergences, especially relating to subjects so vast in extent and so largely incorporated in prophecy. What George Eliot (in *Scenes of Clerical Life*, " Janet's Repentance," p. 125) said is still true : " Religious ideas have the fate of melodies which, once set afloat in the world, are taken up by all sorts of instruments, some of them woefully coarse, feeble, or out of tune, until people are in danger of crying out that the melody itself is detestable." This, we may add, arises frequently from dropping notes, inserting variations, or engrafting unsuitable additions. Then, persons utterly unable to discriminate obtain the crudest or the wildest interpretations of prophecy, and judge all other performances by these specimens. Thus e.g. Wild's *Ten Lost Tribes*, which totally ignores covenant, and overrides everything, to aid its interpretation of David's throne, the Stone, and a hundred other things. (On p. 117 he says : " I charge you to beware of prophetic dentists who put false teeth in the mouth of prophecy." Whatever this new thing, a " prophetical dentist," may be, he seems to fill his own warning.) Or, take Swormstedt's *The End of the World Near*, the truth and kind warnings in it are overshadowed by the palpable nonsense entailed by a rejection of the symbolistic and the substitution of a literalism that is astounding in its results. Hundreds of books, tracts, etc., in this way do a decided injury, repelling inquiry and loading the subject with a reproach that it does not deserve.

Obs. 10. We may add : when regarding the history of this doctrine, how it has been treated ; how it has been perverted ; how it has been held in bigotry ; how believers in it are held apart by incorporated erroneous doctrines ; how bitterness, malice, and presecution have arisen concerning it ; how on the one hand it is hated and abused, and on the other loved and cherished, we are sad at heart, and feel to say, " *How long, O Lord.*" Its history impresses the view that we need our infallible Head, Jesus, to come, so that He Himself may vindicate His own truth, verify His own promises, and bring His brethren into the promised unity. How, then, men will rejoice ; how, then, men will be ashamed.

The intense bigotry presented by some is more saddening than the unbelief of others, for the love which a profession entails is lacking. Professing to obey Jesus in love for His brethren, they refuse to acknowledge them as such and condemn them as debarred from salvation ; professing to receive, e.g. 1 Cor. 13, they deny in practice its teaching. How sad e.g. it is to take up a tract " The Apostolic Church Extinct. No Gospel Believers on the Globe" (by J. K. Speer), and others of a similar tenor, which make all churches " Babel," and deny Christian faith or union to any but themselves, and thus evidence that the first and fundamental principle of true religion, that of charity, is lacking in them. The variations even of error allowed e.g. by the Apostle in 1 Cor. 3 : 11–15, and instanced by " the wood, hay, and stubble," without excluding ultimate salvation (whatever of " loss" may be incurred), has no influence upon the condemnatory spirit and wholesale denunciations of Dr. Thomas and his followers, and a host of others. Let any one presume to differ from them, and they at once are denounced as no Christians. Some men naturally have the disposition of the " Lifters and Anti Lifters" (see art. on M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) and seem to enjoy themselves in " heresy hunting," but carefully omit Sir Th. More's " hair shirt, and whip," because they make it a pleasure and gratification. Bigotry does not now denounce the Greek language as " hereti-

cal," but it approximates very closely to the same ignorance. Bigotry, which exhibits itself by persecution and intolerance in defending adherence to a system, is still extant to a wide extent. Instead of investigation, reliance upon truth, it refuses the liberty of inquiry and fortifies itself by prejudice. Fettered by circumstances it evinces the spirit of persecution without the power of manifesting it excepting in a feeble, but annoying, way; unfettered and having power, it breaks forth into unrelenting persecution, exhibiting the malignity which is its root. Alas! notwithstanding the divine injunctions to charity, etc., so insidious is it that but few men in the past entirely escaped its spirit, as painfully exemplified in the best of men, as e.g. in Luther (*vs.* Zwingli); Calvin (*vs.* Servetus); Wesley, the Moravians, Toplady, etc. (as given in Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*); Bh. Ridley (*vs.* the burning of Joan Bocher and Paris); Knox (justifying Archb. Benton's murder); the Parliament of Scotland (1560, condemning persons to death at the third offence in saying or attending mass); the Kirk Sessions (fining, whipping, branding with hot iron, imprisoning, etc. For these last see Buckle's *His Civ.*, vol. 2, ch. 5, with authorities quoted); the authorities of Basil (digging up the buried body of Joris and burning it); Baxter (against the Baptists, exemplified in Baxter's *Plain Scriptural Proof*, p. 134–36); Archb. Laud (causing Leighton, Prynne, and Burton to loose their ears under High Church pressure); Swedenborg (in his bitterness against the Quakers, see *Diary* of, Oct. 28th and 29th in 1748, for illustration of intolerance divinely revealed—which is the more striking as in direct opposition to his usual amiableness of disposition); Lutherans and Calvinists (enmity between, Motley's *Dutch Republic*, vol. 2, p. 69; comp. controversies between as given by Kurtz, Mosheim, etc., in *Ch. Hist.*); Protestants (lack of sympathy between, as e.g. illustrated in some designating the English martyrs—Rogers, Cranmer, Ridley, and others—"the devil's martyrs," see Hopkins's *Puritans and Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 1, p. 74, and notice Melanchthon's condemning such a spirit); Melanchthon coinciding with Calvin in the Servetus case (Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 154); Jeremy Taylor helping to crush Dissenters (Froude's *English in Ireland*, p. 156–58), Fenelon against the Jansenists (as seen in his denunciatory memoir addressed to Clement XI.); Bossuet and Massillon praising the merciless Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and eulogizing the character of the profligate and cruel Louis XIV., besides ten thousand thousand other instances in the history of the Primitive Church, of Roman Catholicism, of Protestantism, Puritanism, and various sects that have arisen. The slaughter of Bartholomew, the Sicilian Vespers, the dark deeds of "the dark ages," the bloody bitterness of the French Revolution are striking landmarks in its history. It is a part of human nature, an outgrowth of depravity, and has been more or less exhibited in every age, as exemplified even in the history of the Persians, Egyptians, and Romans (Guizot, note to ch. 15 of Gibbon's *Decl. and Fall*, vol. 1, p. 506). Not merely a Loyola, a Mohamet, a Catharine de Medicis, or an Innocent have manifested an intense bigotry, rendered so baneful by the possession of power to enforce it, but multitudes have exhibited it, and often in the most petty or spiteful manner. What must we think e.g. of the book entitled "Dirt Whipt Off" (printed 1672 and levelled against John Bunyan); of the learned Salmasius ridiculing the personal appearance, and even the loss of sight of Milton; of the utter rejection of piety in others, illustrated by Fecht's publicly denying that Spener died a Christian; of the ostentatious ornamenting of shirt bosoms with texts of Scripture (Ben Jonson's *Works*, vol. 2, p. 55, Gifford's note); of the cropping of hair, the cut of the garments, the exclusive use of hooks and eyes in place of buttons, the making the use of tobacco the test of Church or ministerial fellowship (comp. Buckle's *Mis.*, vol. 2, art. 720), etc. Bigotry manifests itself not merely in *Auto-da-fe's*, in the condemnation of a Galileo, or in the hanging of Thomas Aikenhead, etc., but in the sarcastic, contemptuous expression indicative of no belief in piety. This is illustrated in Dr. Johnson, of whom it is said (*Library Notes*, p. 257): "Although 'a majestic teacher of moral and religious wisdom,' when he was in Edinburgh, although personally acquainted with the celebrated Dr. Robertson, he declined going to hear him preach, because he 'would not be seen in a Presbyterian church;' and upon being asked by Boswell where John Knox was buried, burst out, 'I hope in the highway.'" Van Laun (*His. French Lit.*, vol. 2, p. 11) shows how professed Christians, imbued with the bigotry of the times, presented "a deliberate indication and justification of murder," exalting those who were guilty of the same. He in one place (vol. 2, p. 365) mentions Massillon, Madame de Maintenon, Madame de Sévigné, Mademoiselle de Scuddery, Abbé Tallemant des Reux, Corneille, Fontenelle, La Fontaine, La Bruyère, Quinalt, Madame Deshouliers, as praising and rejoicing over, the persecution of Protestants. Montaigne, who denounced cruelty as "the extreme of vices," was still the friend of the Guises and of the bloody Montlac, and affectionately spoke of those who participated in the barbarous cruelties of St. Bartholomew. Charles V. (Prescott's

Philip II., vol. 1, p. 305), even in his last will, conjures his son Philip to persecute every heretic without favor or mercy, and thus insure his blessing and prosperity from the Lord. The cruelty of a Torquemada, or Valdes, mingled with fervent expressions of piety is significant. "The Archbishop of Canterbury" (see art. on "Sir John Oldcastle" in M'Clin. and St. *Cyclop.*), "accompanied by a large body of the clergy, waited upon Henry, and having laid before him the offence of Lord Cobham (entertaining the works of Wickliffe), begged, in all humility and charity, that his majesty would suffer them, for Christ's sake, to put him to death." The spirit of bigotry has been exemplified in Protestantism in the history of Germany, Switzerland, England, Scotland, New England, and others. No country has escaped its baleful influence; no land but has witnessed the cries, the tears, the prayers, the sufferings entailed by its existence. It crops out largely in Cyril's treatment of Hypatia (enlarged upon by Gibbon, Voltaire, Toland, etc.); in the Puritans' condemnation of the Quakers; in the strife of Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants (Motley, etc.); in the Antinomian, Synergistic, Crypto-Calvinistic, and a thousand other controversies; in trifles being elevated to essentials (as e.g. see Wallace's *Russia*, p. 307, where, in a portion of the Greek Church, adherence to the interjection "O," the repetition of "Allelujah," and the position of the fingers in making the sign of the cross, are all essential). It has sheltered itself under piety, humility, love, doctrine, metaphysical distinctions, prophecy, rites and ceremonies, sect spirit, superstition, etc. (Comp. e.g. Bh. Lavington's *Enthusiasm* and kindred works.) Bigotry is the breeder of unreasonable prejudice, most uncharitable judgments, blind and obstinate zeal, persecution, and cruelty. It crushes brotherly affection and love; it fosters spiritual pride and selfishness; it produces anger and malice; it cherishes, where it has the power, fetters and torture, ferocity and bloodshed. When it cannot reach its victim personally, it will at least unchurch him, and consign him to perdition. It will do this under the cloak of superior sanctity, under the plea of greater knowledge and holiness. If it can do no more, it will—instead of meeting the arguments of an opponent—blacken character by an array of epithets that a bigot's heart and mind can only concoct, as e.g. illustrated in Walsingham's portrayal of the illustrious Wycliffe: "He was the devil's instrument, the Church's enemy, the people's confusion, the heretic's idol, the hypocrite's mirror; a sower of hatred, a forger of lies, a sink of flattery; who, at his death, despised like Cain, and stricken by the horrible judgment of God, breathed forth his wicked soul to the dark mansions of the black devil."

To-day this spirit exists widespread, implanting evil passions and unreasonable zeal in behalf of some confessional standard or certain held tenets. In Jerusalem where Christianity arose and urged, as a crowning excellence, the spirit of charity, it exists; and in almost every place where Christianity has found a lodgment it is also found. Thousands and thousands are under its influence: entire bodies are so thoroughly leavened with it that salvation outside of their own organization or sect is an impossibility. Belief in their symbolism, or creed, or principles, or particular tenets, or rites and ceremonies, is made the criterion of salvation. Bigotry has the hardihood to express it openly and frankly in published sermons, tracts and books, glorying in its own shame. It makes no distinction between the published sentiments of opponents (which are proper subjects for legitimate criticism, etc.) and their Christian character, but attacks and portrays the latter in the blackest colors Truth, for its vindication, does not require scorn, obloquy, and detraction; it does not demand the repression of patience, forbearance, meekness, long-suffering, and charity; it commends itself if supported by the Word. Truth to be efficacious does not place itself under a yoke that weighs down the fruits of the Spirit, and brings in a wholesale condemnation and vituperation. We are thankful that the large majority of Pre-Mill. writers, ancient and modern, foreign and American, present the subject of Pre-Mill. in a Christian spirit. However they may differ from others, or criticise the statements of others, or express their decided dissent, this does not interfere with a due respect for Christian profession and love toward those who—whatever error they may possess—love the Saviour. Such "bear the infirmities of the weak" (Rom. 15 : 1), and keep in mind the injunction: "Grudge not one against the other, lest ye be condemned: behold the Judge standeth at the door." The charitable believer ever keeps in view that none is so perfect but that error, more or less, may be attached to him. He does not forget that in the prophetical seven churches all, even the worst, had some believers (Seiss's *Apoc.*, p. 218). Tillotson's declaration may, in spirit, prove true: "We shall have two wonders in heaven; the one, how many come to be absent, whom we expected to find there; the other, how many are there, whom we had no hope of meeting." (Some have added to this: "The greatest wonder will be that we ourselves are there.") Harris (*Mammon*, Lec. 6) justly rebukes the selfishness of the sect, creed,

pulpit, and pew. Alas! Sectism is still in many, more powerful than love for the Church generally; Creedism is still erected into the standard by which the Word itself is to be measured and all others judged; Pulpitism is still in many cases limiting the true sons and daughters of God within its own hearing and influence; Pewism is yet flattering itself with its personal connection as infinitely superior and holier than that of others; and all this is offensively paraded before us as a warning how depravity can and does override grace. Luther (quoted, Sprecher's *Groundwork Theol.*, p. 38) once said: "A Christian, holy people is to be known by this, that it has the Word of God, although this be unequally treated. Some have it entirely pure; some not. Wherever God's Word has free course, there, also, there will always be believers. Further, if I see that they preach and acknowledge Christ as sent of God the Father, that He might, through His death, obtain for us reconciliation and grace with Him, then we are one in substance, and I regard them as dear brethren in Christ, and as members of the Christian Church." (So Luther loved Zwingle notwithstanding differences of doctrine; for at the death of Zwingle and Œcolampadius he—D'Aubigne's *His. Ref.*, vol. 4, p. 478—said: "Their death filled me with such intense sorrow that I was near dying myself.") Gladstone (*Contemp. Review*, 1876, in "The Courses of Relig. Thought") says that the eminent Dr. Norman Macleod declared, "that many an opponent of dogma is nearer to God than many an orthodox believer." This arises simply upon what Dr. Sprecher (*Groundw. Theol.*, p. 22) so forcibly expresses: "Saving faith depends not so much upon the reception of fundamental articles of doctrine, as upon the surrender of one's self to the personal Saviour—an act of which the young child as well as the mature man, the ignorant peasant as well as the learned theologian, is capable. The works of the intellect can, no more than those of the will of the Church, be regarded as necessary to salvation." Two extremes are to be avoided: first, the idea that knowledge, expressive presentation of truth or faith, and zeal is sufficient without love (1 Cor. 13); second, that ignorance, lack of doctrinal correctness, etc., may not exist (1 Cor. 3) in connection with salvation. (As to rewards in salvation, see Prop. 135.) Men distinguished for high theological talent, ministers of renowned eloquence and ability, have manifested less of the fruits of the Spirit, less amiable and affectionate Christian spirit, less of pervading love to Jesus, than persons far their inferiors in knowledge, attainments, and culture. Those who reflect over this, imparted by Scripture and observation, will be slow to condemn. Rather would we take and appropriate Macleod's prayer (*Memoirs*, vol. 2, p. 317): "Oh, my Father, keep me humble. Help me to have respect toward my fellow-men, to recognize their several gifts as from Thee. Deliver me from the diabolical sins of malice, envy, or jealousy, and give me hearty joy in my brother's good, in his work, in his gifts and talents; and may I be truly glad in his superiority to myself, if Thou art glorified. Root out all weak vanity, all devilish pride, all that is abhorrent to the mind of Christ. God hear my prayer. God grant me the wondrous joy of humility, which is seeing Thee as all in all." The man that can truly imbibe the spirit of such a prayer cannot be bigoted. He will not blacken others to exalt himself, but will deal—firmly if argument demands it, but—courteously with others, as e.g. Bh. Lowth to John Wesley (Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*, p. 252, vol. 3). He will not, like the Abbot Adam of Persiquy, esteem himself so able that he apprehends the mysteries of the Bible as clearly as the original writers; or, like men at the present day, that he vastly exceeds them in knowledge. Like Bh. Leighton (Stanley's *Lec. His. Ch. Scotland*) he rather says, virtually acknowledging his inferiority and liability to error: "Deliver me, O Lord, from the errors of wise men, yea, and of good men." Richard Baxter, said to be the author of one hundred and sixty-eight theological works, and to have been frequently in stern controversy, wrote near the close of his life: "I now see more good and more evil in all men than heretofore I did. I see that good men are not so good as I once thought they were, and I find that few are so bad as either their malicious enemies or censorious separating professors imagine." "I will not be one" (he says in another place—*Works*, 23 : 27, and 16 : 368; Littell's *Liv. Age*, vol. 127, art. on Baxter,) that shall condemn or reject a lover of God and Christ and holiness for want of distinct particular knowledge, or words to utter it aright." "Own no man's errors or sins, but own every man that owneth Christ, and whom Christ will own, notwithstanding those errors and infirmities that he may be guilty of. Bear with those that Christ will bear with; especially learn the master duty of self-denial, for it is self that is the greatest enemy of Catholicism." A thousand similar quotations might be adduced from God's children, but these will suffice; for they sufficiently indicate the spirit of the writer, viz., that however he may, in the esteemed interests of truth, question and criticise the statements of friend and opponent, he does not condemn them as condemned by Christ. Jesus is the Judge, and those who love Him, even in weakness, He also loves.

PROPOSITION 180. *This doctrine of the Kingdom will not be received, in faith, by the World.*

Whatever the force of argument presented, whatever the intellectual or moral aspect relating to it, whatever the historical attestment bearing upon it, however even desirable it may be in its meeting the wants of humanity, etc., this same Word teaches us that *it never will find acceptance* with the multitude; that it will be opposed by successive unbelief, which will finally culminate, at the time this Kingdom is to be manifested, in asserting its sway (Rev. 19, etc.) over the nations and mighty men of the earth. The faith required, from its inception to completion, *in the Supernatural*, is alone sufficient to ostracize it in the estimation of a host. But even our opponents must concede that with the guide we have received, the implicit trust evinced in its teaching thus far, the evidences adduced in support of our faith in the final accomplishment of the Plan proposed, it would argue *inconsistency or insincerity* in us if we did not also earnestly receive and believe in the predictions which portray the extraordinary state of unbelief universally prevailing just before the ushering in of this Kingdom. Especially so in a day when it is so widely intrenching itself in the hearts and minds of able, learned, and eminent men, and from thence reaching for and extending over the swarming armies of invited followers.

The increase of infidelity is so palpable in the present day that it needs no confirmation. Van Oosterzee, Christlieb, Dale, Tholuck, and others have eloquently represented the matter. The press is throwing off a multitude of evidences which speak for themselves, and popular literature is filled with the same. As an illustration simply of its widespread workings, let the reader turn to art. 3, *Westminster Review*, Jan., 1862, which indorses a "Free Religion" (by which it means that man can believe and do as he pleases), which appoints "intellect a guide, conscience a judge, and history a guardian and prophet" (not allowing a superior), and which rejoices over the numerous "heresies within the Church pale," declaring that "the discoverers and writers in literature and science are necessarily heretics;" that "the men of letters who are either servants of, or worshippers in, the orthodox churches are few in number and minor celebrities at the best;" that "the popular theology has only a Sunday existence; human nature and common-sense claim the rest of the week;" that "among the working classes indifferentism and utter unbelief extensively prevail," etc. So art. 8, July, 1861, etc. So e.g. Brookes's art. in March No. of the *Princeton Review*, 1879, sadly confesses that unbelief is widely extending both in the Church and outside of it, becoming "a very pervading thing" among all classes, etc.

Obs. 1. Let no fault be found with us by true intelligence, *when honesty, to the principles avowed and to the Book*, compels us, aside from lower considerations that could be urged, to assign *the true reason* for such unbelief. This Theocratic Order covenanted can be seen in its historical standing, its design, etc., and may even be appreciated in its adaptability to secure

the end contemplated, but unfortunately for the multitude—fortunately for the few—it sustains more than an intellectual relationship, viz., a *moral or religious*, and demands in view of the latter *certain qualifications* for entrance into, and enjoyment of, the Kingdom which requires *a preparation* that is humiliating to man, such as repentance and a faith which appropriates the Gospel of the Kingdom in its gracious provisions, manifested by acceptance of and obedience to them. This necessarily leads to *a confession of sinfulness* (which the truth of God, adapted to the receptive powers of man, if received, enforces by self-consciousness) that is *so distasteful* to the natural man, *so derogatory* to the high praises of Humanitarian ideas respecting the dignity of man, that we are gravely told by Parker and others that Christianity "*degrades man.*" The very Plan designed to restore man, the race and the world *to forfeited blessings*, to remove *the curse* oppressing nature, to bring humanity into *the most intimate and endearing relations* with the Creator Himself, to introduce *the long-desired relief* by the world-wide dominion of the Theocratic King with the first-born of past generations glorified and reigning with Him ; all this, and more (including *the love and mercy* displayed in the gift of Jesus Christ and His death), is an alleged degradation of man ! *Why* this express charge against the noblest design of Redemption and the most glorious manifestation of love that the world has ever witnessed? The naked truth, which this same Word gives, respecting the unwillingness of men to receive Divine Revelation *in its totality*, arises not so much from dislike to representations made concerning the Plan of Redemption and its blessings as evinced in the Theocratic arrangement, *but in the demands made upon the heart and life. Pride* revolts at the humiliation that must precede exaltation ; *pride* rebels against the duties that are enforced before victory is attained ; *pride* turns away from a cross that must be borne before the wished-for glorification can be received ; the heart inclined to love evil, to cherish selfishness, to seek pleasure and gratification, *rejects the denial of self and of evil* imposed by the Word, and hence seeks, in order *to escape the obligations* thus presented, to invalidate the Word itself. Admitting that some (as we have repeatedly intimated) are swayed by other motives—are honest and sincere in their convictions against the truth (perhaps moved by surrounding influences, education, etc.), yet it is also true (even of all when once brought into contact with the truth) of a large class—the immense majority—that "*this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil, hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved,*" John 3 : 19, 20. Here a masterly hand in a few sentences lays bare *the leading cause* of opposition to the Bible. The condemnatory nature of both law and Gospel, the requirements of the Bible from the individual, the humbling doctrines associated with Redemption—alas, these form *the great stumbling-blocks* to the Christian religion. These, as the Spirit teaches us, form *the cause* why not only the Biblical idea of God, of the world, of the means of Redemption, but even the most gracious help afforded through the life and death of Jesus Christ, are, notwithstanding the appeal made to our necessities and to a responsive consciousness, set aside for mere theories, often the most antagonistic and condemnatory of each other. If the opposition, so natural to man, and for which he is held responsible, had developed itself into one grand systematic method—the boasted offspring of pure reason, etc.—*then*

it might in virtue of its unity at least, commend itself for strength, and thus inspire respect. but let any one read the history of the diversified views, successive philosophies, hostile to the Bible, and he must be struck with a marked feature in them all, viz., a lack of cohesion, a positive difference forbidding combination, a palpable contradicting of each other, etc., so that the only bond that really unites them is *the same spirit of hostility* to the Bible evinced by each of them. The differences of Christians are alleged (and often with force and a degree of justness, forgetting, however, that it is predicted by the Word, and is a resultant of free moral agency) *a* reason for rejecting the truth, and if a reason proper to receive as a rule for guidance, its application to our opponents ought to be *even more forcible*, seeing that their differences are immensely greater and more irreconcilable, extending from Atheism and Theism and Optimism down through every grade of opinion to its latest revived forms of Pessimism and Nihilism, affording *an index of the heart* as well as of the reason. And in this wide range we have the professedly higher scientific and philosophical attacks which busy themselves with questions pertaining to man, the world, and the universe (assuming man to be the umpire of truth, present nature to be the measurer of the past, the Supernatural to be impossible, what the Absolute only can do, the eternal unchangeableness of nature's laws, etc.) down to those lower attacks (which the former with us utterly condemn) upon the moral character of Jesus, of God, of Christianity, outraging all feeling of propriety, and prostituting the moral sense. For, as caricatures of Christianity exist, so, in justice to even our opponents of intelligence and refinement, we must say that caricatures of their higher opposition exist in a way that they themselves repudiate with deserved indignation.[1] But candor requires us to add that the highest even to the lowest criticism which (as e.g. *Modern Christianity a Civilized Heathenism*, which ignores Jesus in His social aspect, etc.) makes, against experience, etc., it impossible to live the life required by Christ, originates *mainly* from the cause just assigned. Hence, the Bible challenges each one to test the truth by an experimental knowledge of it: "*if any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself*," John 7 : 17. It is owing to this simple fact, *the adaptedness* of the truth to man's moral nature and needs, and upon its acceptance the resultant effect upon himself, that the unlearned believer, ignorant of many things, and even holding to things which are erroneous, is *so well fortified* against unbelief; for against all adverse argument which he cannot answer he has one that *triumphantly* meets the same, viz., *personal experience of the truth.* Intellectual unbelief (i.e. unbelief derived from reason), while it may and does exist independently, is greatly prompted and influenced by what the Word calls "*an evil heart of unbelief*" (Heb. 3 : 12), i.e. an unbelief springing more directly from our sentient nature, the affections, desires, etc.—and the reason why so much stress is laid upon *the heart* in the question of receiving and rejecting the truth of the Word (as e.g. Rom. 10 : 9, 10; 6 : 17, etc.) is because it is *the great prompter* (as experience shows) of human action, too often overriding the understanding and will, crushing conscience and judgment beneath its ascendency. Reason has witnesses, the understanding has demonstrations, the judgment has evidence, all given by God, to testify to the truth, but *the heart* is unwilling to be bound and controlled by them. God, who knows what is in man, warns us that right here is *the main, leading difficulty*, and sincere faith in

His wisdom leads us unhesitatingly to adopt this view, corroborated by the united testimony of all who have ever received and obeyed the truth against the pleadings, promptings, and dislikes of the heart. The fact is that this very constant appeal to the heart, constituting it *the main factor* of belief, laying open its power and influence, is in itself evidence of a divine knowledge of human nature exceeding that of mere man.[2]

[1] As e.g. such outbursts of malevolence as the following: The Free Thinkers (*Luth. Obs.*, Jan. 30th, 1874) of Palermo, Italy, started a paper called the *Journal of the Disciples of Satan.* The association greeted the paper with, "We salute the birth of a paper which bears the name of the true God, the God of science, liberty, and progress—the God we worship—Satan." Many intelligent and refined unbelievers recoil from such exhibitions of—to say the very least—bad taste. Of course the utterances of the Free-love branch, the ultra-Communistic branch, etc., are in the same category.

[2] Even as far as reason is concerned, we commend this utterance of Dr. Sprecher (*Groundwork of Theol.*, p. 68), who, after ably showing that the Christian consciousness is independent of science, being based upon a personal experience of the truth, "a spiritual realism," concludes: "And, as we shall see in the proper place, there is really no room for mere rationalism at the present day; that the more complete analysis of thought has shown that the only consistent ground of an intelligent opposition to special or miraculous revelation, is that of *pure atheistic naturalism;* that in the high stage of thinking to which the human has, at last, come, *the final choice must be between heathenism and Christianity, down-right atheism or true theism*—the theism which admits the possibility and desirableness of special revelation." The Scriptures tell us *what the choice* will be; and the tendency, to-day, is seen in eminent scientists and scholars taking this naturalistic ground and approvingly quoting the maxims and lessons of ancient heathen. Bushnell (*Nat. and Supernat.*, p. 453) speaking of the lack of faith in the Supernatural (which strikes a deadly blow at Jesus, His claims, and the appropriation of Him), says: "The Christian world has been gravitating visibly, more and more, toward this vanishing point of faith, for whole centuries, and especially since the modern era of science began to shape the thoughts of men by only scientific methods. Religion has fallen into the domain of mere understanding, and so it has become a kind of wisdom not to believe much, therefore, to expect little." And (p. 21), "thus far the tendency is visible, on every side, to believe in nature simply, and in Christianity only so far as it conforms to nature and finds shelter under its laws. And the mind of the Christian world is becoming every day, more and more saturated with this propensity to naturalism; gravitating, as it were, by some fixed law, though imperceptibly or unconsciously, toward a virtual and real unbelief in Christianity itself." Such utterances from men of all classes could be multiplied. Indeed, so widespread has this become that scientific writers triumphantly refer to it as an indication and assurance of ultimate victory, as seen e.g. in the writings of Draper, Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Fiske, etc. Professed believers, having no practical belief and experience, having a form of godliness and denying the power, assist in this work and congratulate themselves in the efficiency of their agency, as e.g. exemplified in the writings of the "Broad Church" party. Christianity suffers severely from professed friends and adherents, who, Judas-like, betray with an alleged kiss of peace. Open infidelity is more honest, more honorable, and less dangerous. The fair and plain statements of the latter, evidence at least candor. Let the student ponder the concessions of one of these (corroborative of Dr. Sprecher's preceding statement), "Physicus" in his *Candid Examination of Theism.* After, in detail, showing how science refutes the idea of the existence of a God, and how he is forced to such a conclusion, he laments his inability to accept of the once consoling and inspiring Theism, admits the chilling nature of his natural faith, refers to its depressing influence upon himself, and declares that, "so far as the ruination of individual happiness is concerned, no one can have a more lively perception than myself of the possibly disastrous tendency of my work." Hypocrites rejoice in it.

Obs. 2. There is no doubt that unbelief is largely generated by the opinion, entertained in various quarters, that the expression given by the Church in formularies, etc., in different periods of the Church, must be "*unconditionally accepted,*" and that the Bible itself "*can only be understood in the light of that faith which we receive from the Church.*" This

assumption is built upon the arrogated premise of a universal faith expressed in these formularies. Admitting a few general truths, as e.g. those pertaining to God, Christ, etc., to exist in them all, yet when the premise is tested even by fundamental truths it is found to be incorrect and unverified in the history of the Church, and the diversity of doctrine pertaining even to the admitted general truths disclose the same. Thus, to illustrate: take the leading subject of preaching, that of "the Gospel of the Kingdom"—the main doctrine of the Kingdom—and contrast the prevailing views—said to be derived under this fostering light of the creeds, etc.—respecting these things, with the faith exhibited by pious Jews and the early Christian Church, and the wide contrast between ancient and modern faith is seen at once. The multiplicity of meanings given to the Kingdom of God alone indicates *how much reliance* can be placed in a "universal Church faith" which places itself first and the Bible second; which contends that the Word of God cannot be properly understood without first receiving the word of man. The faith of others, however valuable and precious, is only corroborative and not a foundation; confirmative, but not positive proof. It may, or it may not, be in unison with the Bible. This, too, is based on an exaggerated view of the Church, constituting it the covenanted Kingdom of David's Son and continuing and manifesting prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices of Jesus Christ in the ministry, etc. The man of intelligence with the Bible before him, with the history of the apostolic and primitive Church, with the evidences of human infirmity in the dogmatic formulation of Biblical statements, with the changes, modifications engrafted, with the assumptions of Church authority, etc., feels that if he accepts of the faith *as now generally expressed*, with the variations as existing, he must exercise a belief in a great measure *the very opposite* of that entertained by ancient worthies; and hence, without endeavoring to account for such substitution on the ground of human weakness, without considering that such differences do not alter the contents and doctrines of Holy Writ, without regarding the predictions which describe such a state as certain to follow, owing to man's imperfection, without reflecting that amid these differences a bond of union on the practical, experimental side (finding its responsiveness in the moral nature) still exists—he unfortunately *rejects both* the ancient and modern faith, *both* the Bible and the formulated creeds, *both* the Word and the Church. And the feeling that there is such an antagonism between the old faith and the new *is deepening and widening*, finding its expression in numerous works, which triumphantly point, e.g. to the Jewish belief and the primitive Christian, and then to the one introduced later and now so prevailing, concerning the Church and Kingdom. The Apologetics, instead of *fairly meeting* this question of change by directing attention to the predictions and passages which teach it, finding no Scripture to sustain the alterations of belief, while admitting the early belief (forced to it by historical necessity) apologize for it *in a manner* (as an accommodation, as justifiable error, as still containing a germ to be developed into the produced truth, etc.) which not only excites the ridicule of our opponents, confirms them in unbelief, sustains their critical deductions, but actually makes out the multitude of ancient pious believers to have lived *in the grossest misconception* of the leading burden of prophecy, that of the Kingdom.

Instead of faith in the Messianic Kingdom, they speak (as in a Liberal paper called *Man*) of the future glorious "Kingdom of man." They boast of this departure as e.g.

illustrated in the meeting of the "Free Religionists" at New York, in opposition to the Evang. Alliance, when Tilton (of *The Golden Age*) and others eulogized their "Church of the Future" a Kingdom of union, love, freedom, etc. At this meeting (*Luth. Obs.*, Oct. 31st, 1873) Gannett of Boston said: "They call us infidels and we accept the name." Frothingham in the Introduction to *Freedom and Fellowship* refers with evident satisfaction to the weaknesses of Protestantism, the history of the Evang. Alliance, the sectarian divisions, dogmatic prejudices, party jealousies, pressure and increase of rationalism, modifications of theology, etc., and says: "The 'Christian World' contains more non-Christians and anti-Christians than Christians; more unbelievers than believers; more unworshipful than worshipful; more luke-warm than ardent; more irreverent people than reverent. The naturalists outnumber the supernaturalists. The rationalists carry more weight than the fideists. This is so, at all events, in the centres of thought, and the centres of thought are the fountains of thought. The live mind of the world—meaning by the live mind the inquisitive mind—is deserting Christianity for philosophy, science, and literature." The conclusion will be that humanity emancipated and brought into unity of fellowship, will erect a Kingdom of humanity. In "Faith and Verification" (art. in Littell's *Liv. Age*, Nov. 16th, taken from the *Nineteenth Century*) Mallock, after denouncing the foundations of Christian faith, after saying "perhaps the reign of faith is over," still thinks that there is yet some" stuff left in the world as religious dreams are made of," and that there may—owing to religious elements still existing—be after a while a return to faith (i.e. a liberal one), and declares that many now prayerless and creedless, "would exclaim in a moment, could they think such a Coming possible, '*Even so, come Lord Jesus.*'" What a condemnatory sarcasm!

Obs. 3. Some late writers (as e.g. D. H. Olmstead in a *Lec. on the Protestant Faith*), to vindicate their position of unbelief, have endeavored to show (philosophically) that faith is involuntary, and that hence man *is not responsible* for what he believes. Without entering into a discussion whether faith is voluntary or not, whether the product of reason, or of reason and the will combined, whether the result of evidence or intention, or divine aid annexed, it is amply sufficient for our purpose to merely indicate a few things which clearly demonstrate that God justly holds us *responsible* for our belief. Take the extreme ground that it is involuntary in any sense, yet it is properly demanded from us in view of its being in some way (explain it as we may) the outgrowth of our nature, so that the moral sense of the world has *always held man accountable* for faith resulting in corresponding action. While human law does not take cognizance of faith, of belief in the abstract, it does so when either faith or unbelief evinces itself in *action contrary to the law.* Thus e.g. refusal to obey law because of unbelief is *never* excused; the commission of crime under the plea of faith is *never* admitted. It is true that the faith required by God, in its gracious appropriating power, may not and cannot be exercised without a certain amount of truth, to which the moral nature responds, being brought to bear upon the heart, just as intellectual faith cannot be produced without the evidence adduced which persuades reason to accept of the same. But in this case, faith being *the resultant of a condition* in which man can, and is invited to, place himself, so long as *he refuses* to place himself in the position favorable to receive faith and experience its power, *man is responsible* for the lack of faith. Faith is both *a necessity and an elevator* of man, for while knowledge may and does precede, yet faith is the producer of action. Truth may be without us, objective, and it may even be coldly received by reason, but faith makes it subjective, living within us, appropriating it and sending it forth in action, in works, in teeming volumes, etc. Besides this, the faith which God calls for and with which alone He is satisfied, is created by things which God alone can present. Let, e.g. the truth respecting man's sinfulness find (by meditation, etc.) a response

in man's self-consciousness, *then* comes the divine plan, which God has given, through Christ for deliverance from such a state, commending itself by *its adaptability* to meet our necessities and to bestow the promised blessings, which the heart, softened by the truth through the Spirit, receives, gratefully accepts and conscientiously applies, thus forming (Heb. 9 : 1) "*the substance* (ground, confidence) *of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen,*" in its corresponding effect upon the individual.[1] The Bible, without any scientific definition of faith, or nice philosophical distinctions respecting its rise in man, certainly teaches that in some way faith is voluntary (we do not say necessarily or directly, but at least indirectly), seeing that it is commanded (e.g. 1 John 3 : 23, etc.), that men can refuse to believe (John 20 : 27, etc.), and that they are condemned for the lack of it (John 3 : 18 ; Heb. 10 : 38, 39 ; Rev. 21 : 8, etc.). Whatever God may do to produce it either in the bestowal of our mental and moral constitution, or in bringing the truth in contact with our hearts, etc., it is also said to be excited by the evidence presented in the Word (John 20 : 31), and by the proclamation of the truth (Rom. 10 : 8–17), evincing that reason or the understanding (Acts 8 : 30–37, and Paul with the Jews, etc.) and the will (John 5 : 39, 40) *are concerned* in it. From all this it is proper to infer that such is the constitution of man, that he is *impelled to believe* when the proper evidence is given and it receives due attention, and that, therefore, it is folly for any one to deny the faith God asks for *before he has actually placed himself in the position requisite* to secure the evidence. The difficulty with the multitude, who hold with Lord Byron that "man is not responsible for his belief," is, that the responsibility arises from *a deliberate rejection* of the evidence, from *a wilful choosing* not to pay attention to it, from *an unwillingness* to place themselves in the only position favorable to its attainment, *because it makes self-sacrifice imperative.* The position of the faithless man is well represented in Rev. 3 : 20 ; Jesus stands at the door and knocks, i.e. waiting patiently and calling attention to His gracious presence ; now "*if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to him,*" etc., i.e. the door will not be forced, but man himself must "hear," regard the invitations, and manifest willingness to receive the Saviour, and *then* the blessings will follow. With these prefatory remarks the reason why so many (as the writer alluded to) excuse themselves from the exercise of faith in God's Word becomes apparent ; and to confirm the same, claim the right of being *the supreme judge* in matters of faith and of thus making the Bible submit to their own judgment, because of a universal moral law which is antecedent to revelation. But admitting the antecedency of morality, instead of elevating man to a supreme judgeship and of giving to him the absolute authority to receive or reject, it places him in *a subsidiary* position. For the very *conformity* of revelation to the demands of the moral sense, to the dictates of conscience enforcing morality, is not merely a proof of the prior existence of the moral nature, and that an appeal is thus made to it, for judging of its correctness, but proof, in virtue of its adaptability or suitableness to meet the conditions of such a nature, of *the divine origin of revelation.* It evinces also the claim of Revelation that *God has implanted* the moral nature, and that having made it *responsive*—constitutionally—to certain truths, when the latter are presented and duly considered, *the former will be duly affected.* The relationship between the two, evidenced by the effects produced (as between the seed and the means of fruitage, the eye and light, etc.) shows that *both proceed* from the

same Almighty Maker and Governor. The lowest form of unbelief denies the power of conscience, but latterly numerous writers, realizing that it was utterly untenable, take the higher form of admitting it, but constituting it *the supreme judge* over all things, including the Bible itself. But this, in connection with what has been said, is disproven by the fact that, judge or monitor as it may be, its monitions or judgments, its sense of moral fitness and obligations, are frequently *overridden;* that its judgments may by repeated violations, etc., become *imperfect, weakened, and defective*, which makes it unsuitable to occupy the position of *an absolute judge*, seeing that the decisions are trampled upon and remain unenforced. The feelings of self-consciousness, arising from obeying or violating the moral sense or conscience, indicate in self-approbation or self-abasement the sense of *accountability to a higher power.* To this God appeals in the approval of a good conscience and in the condemning of our own hearts, in the accusing or excusing process. The authoritative decisions of conscience stand related *to both man and God*—to man as a guide if properly received, and to God as a means of enforcing an acknowledgment of His supremacy and man's accountability to Himself. The possession of such a monitor is decisive proof that man *is under moral government*, and *the correspondence* between the demands of the moral law as given in the Word of God and the untrammelled dictates of conscience *confirm man's responsibilities* by pointing out the Being under whose government he lives, and to whom he is accountable. But to make man's conscience or reason the supreme, sole, absolute judge under the controlling influence of a will which, after all, may choose to obey or disobey its dictates or reasoning, is to say that man is under moral obligation, but only to himself, and that after all the only law which is binding upon him is that of his own will. The Word of God takes still higher ground when it assumes and enforces its authority over conscience, reason, will, etc., by its declarations of *moral obligation existing unimpaired*—however violated by man—*in virtue of the relationship that man sustains to God and to his fellow-men*, and to which man's consciousness bears conclusive evidence in the eulogies bestowed upon the unchangeableness of moral law. Besides this, in making up a decision in reference to this matter, *the experience of the individual* in the heartfelt reception of the Bible, ought to be taken in account, seeing that, as the Word *challenges every one to the test*, the influence of the truth upon the heart, the evidences of its perfect adaptedness and adjustment to man's nature personally experienced, the relationship that the moral and spiritual sustain to one definite Divine Plan, elevates *the Bible at once into the supreme arbiter and sole rule of faith and action.* The attack, insidious as it may be; the excuse, flattering as it is to man, is *inexcusable*, because based on part of the truth only, considering man's capabilities only, and then ignoring man's experience and man's relationship to a higher Being. Hence, owing to the moral aspect of the Word, its moral demands and requirements, men seek to justify their non-acceptance of it on various and often contradictory grounds. And this is not confined simply to one portion of the Word, for with its moral side rejected, of course everything else falls with it. Therefore it is, that this doctrine of the Kingdom will find *no favor*, not because of the Theocratic order assigned, or the blessings included in it, or the glory of the reign predicted, etc., but because of *the moral fitness, moral requirements, the believing Christian life* that is so imperatively, so authoritatively demanded by God before it can be inherited by us. The life of

faith required before entrance into it, is not a life of *blind* faith, but of *seeing* faith, of *appropriating* faith, of faith *resulting in corresponding action;* and such a faith being *unpalatable* to man, forms *the secret spring* of opposition.[2]

[1] While rejecting, on the one hand, the notion that justifying faith is mere assent, and, on the other, that it is something entirely superadded, the mean between the two may be stated as follows: Man is so constituted mentally and morally that truths, when subjected to his understanding intuitively awaken faith by influencing the will; the relation between truth and man's consciousness of moral fitness, etc., arousing it. Evangelical truth affects this by first enlightening the understanding through the Word, applied by the Spirit, and justifying faith is such an acceptance of and confiding in the truth, or in the mercy of God through Jesus Christ on the conditions imposed by the Gospel. Therefore it is (1) a voluntary act because largely dependent upon voluntary action in man necessarily preceding it; (2) that for the proper exercise of it man is dependent upon God, whose help is promised; (3) that its exercise, viewed as an outgrowth of man's nature when brought into contact with the truth, as a result of God-given truth and divine assistance imparted, is in a legitimate sense "the gift of God." Apprehension of the truth, however brought about, must stand connected with faith. In one sense then faith is involuntary, being the product of our constitution under certain conditions; in another it is rightly called voluntary because it is optional with man to place himself under the conditions which produce it.

[2] Let not the reader think that we enter too much in detail and defence of the truth and of the believer's position. These very objections will again and again be renewed, and finally culminate in bringing about the adhesion of the masses to the future incoming rule and power of the last Antichrist. We only add: men, unaided, could never have devised the covenanted Messianic Kingdom with its requirements for inheriting the same, *because opposed to human nature.* In man's devising, we have a variety of kingdoms, but none that aspire to the purity, majesty, and grandeur of that pertaining to David's Son. Man never invented the God of the Bible and His glorious perfections, brought into direct Theocratic relationship to man in the most perfect of governments. To see what man can do, it is only necessary to consider Mill's imperfect and impotent God. Man never concocted the biblical scheme of Redemption, on the one side so humiliating to man, and on the other so daring that it reaches to the sacrifice of God's own dear Son. To see this it is only requisite to notice the naturalistic and humanitarian schemes of redemption, which exalt man and pride themselves in rejecting Supernatural aid to get rid of sin and the curse. Men, naturally loving sin, could never have devised the denunciations of sin and the holiness of life demanded as given in the Bible. To see this, it is only necessary to look at that which multitudes of its rejecters have offered in substitute.

Obs. 4. Hume stated, what is now so often reiterated, that "Our holy religion does not rest *on reason, but faith;*" and some of the Apologists of Christianity, overlooking that revelation itself by its very bestowal, indicates *the capability* of man to examine, learn, and know its contents; that it appeals to and makes demands upon *reason*, have conceded that Hume is correct, and have endeavored to confirm it by hypotheses concerning the limits of reason, making all truth subjective, etc. This, however, is unjust *both* to the Bible and the experience of true believers. The Word of God introduces *both reason and faith as essential to a true Christian life, to a correct reception of the truth.* Theoretically, i.e. in its doctrinal aspect, it depends on reason, and hence we are urged to use *reason;* practically, i.e. personal experience of the power of truth, it depends on *faith*, and faith is enforced. To comprehend the nature, design, necessity, etc. of the Divine Plan, *reason* is required; to realize its application to ourselves individually, *faith*, leading to personal acceptance and corresponding works, must be conjoined; to test the whole truth in its objective and subjective relationship, *both* are needed, *both* are commanded. Disconnecting what

God has joined together, is the cause why so many are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." The Bible is not afraid of reason; for *it confidently appeals to reason*, knowing that its sacred truths, its Divine Plan, if apprehended by reason as it should be, will, by the very laws controlling the intellectual nature of man, *commend themselves* to us. It is true that reason may be restrained, turned aside, or its decisions be rejected by the love of self and darkness, by the contraction of Bible utterances to the preconceived prejudices entertained or to the limits of some confessional standard, human system, etc. It is also true that reason may be so sanctified, brought under the influence of the truth, that it will still more clearly apprehend the truth through a personal practical experience of the same. But in the very nature of the case, as Revelation is *a communication* to man in his own language, *appeals* to sinners in the usage of their own language, it follows that reason is not to be discarded as some teach, who (as e.g. Mansell, Miller, etc.) manifest this to be an extreme by their cogent reasoning on other points, and even in presenting such a conclusion through a process of reasoning. The application of the laws of language, the comparing of Scripture with Scripture, the criticism of the text, the study of analogy, etc., are all evidences of the intellectual inseparably connected with faith, fostering and cherishing faith, and assigning reasons for the faith within us. Moral qualifications, so precious, cannot dispense with the intellectual; purification, so valuable, cannot cast aside but includes reason. It is owing to the constitution of man in this respect and his ability to understand God's Word by using the capacity, the faculties, given to him, by interpreting the Book according to the universally received laws of language, that God justly holds him accountable for its rejection, and declares that the truth thus refused—*owing to his capacity to understand it*—shall judge him in the last day. While reason is not the rule of faith (as shown by numerous writers, e.g. Prof. Loy, *Evang. Quart. Review*, Jan., 1871), it is also true that faith is not the rule of reason; for they are *sisters, going hand in hand and mutually supporting each other*, making the Word of God *alone the rule, the guide*, as received by them. Where reason fails, as in things beyond its comprehension, faith steps in and aids reason to settle down into the reasonable conviction (yea, even to make it an evidence of the divine), that as there are things in nature utterly inexplicable, etc., so in "the things of God," we ought to expect things beyond our power to fully explain. As Pascal said: "the last step of reason is to know that there is an infinitude of things which surpass it." For, the supreme authority of Scripture over both reason and faith is found, not only in its adaptability to man's necessities, but in the fact that man, with all his powers, is utterly incapable of presenting a Plan and devising the means for the removal of the evils and the bestowment of the blessings longed for by humanity *as they are given in God's Word*. A consideration of our needs and that of the world, and *then* of the remarkable Divine Purpose in Redemption which so accurately meets and provides for these, in connection with *an earnest* of experimental knowledge, the historical evidences, the past and present fulfilment of prophecy, etc., form such *a combination of proof*, such *a union* of necessity and provision, that reason and faith acknowledge it as immensely superior to anything that humanity can produce. Faith, with its practical results, its invigorating influence, its blessed fruits, confirms and strengthens reason in its deductions; reason, in turn, by searching the

Scriptures (Acts 17 : 11), by proving all things (1 Thess. 5 : 21), etc., enlarges the scope of faith and establishes more firmly its power over man ; while both together recognize, impelled by the unity existing between the intellectual and moral, and between seeing and experiencing, *the authority of God's Word.* Hence, when we say that this Kingdom of God is a subject of faith, that it can only in its entirety be received by faith, we do not at the same time discard reason. The meaning simply is that it is a matter exclusively of Divine Revelation, Procedure, and Consummation. Man could not plan, reveal, prepare for, and finally establish it. This is seen by the divine incorporated with it and forming its earthly Ruler, and by the Supernatural elements mingled with it. It is *above reason* in inception, provisions, establishment, etc., and at the same time it is *not opposed to reason,* but, on the contrary, when we regard the Scriptural statements respecting it, the Kingdom appeals to our reason *as most desirable, as perfectly adapted* to secure complete restoration from all evil and *as being pre-eminently fitted* to bestow, through such a David's Son, the blessings promised. Reason, bowing before its covenanted equity, happiness, and glory, gratefully recognizes the authority expressing it, while faith appropriates those things, affecting the heart and life, urging on to such an obedience as insures the hope of ultimate participation in it. Many things pertaining to the Kingdom, yea, even the Kingdom itself as still future and to be re-established at the Advent of Jesus Christ, are matters of promise, and therefore can only be received by faith in God's promises. Such faith, however, is confirmed by reason, tracing the Theocratic order as laid down in the Word, seeing its connection with the initiatory and preparatory measures instituted (of which he himself is a living witness, if believing), and in beholding the evidences of a progressive and ever advancing Divine Purpose in the past and the present. Those who exalt reason to the disparagement of faith, who constitute reason the supreme judge (as e.g. Frothingham in *Religious Aspects of the Age*)—telling us that "the only real infidelity which is a sin in the sight of God is a disbelief in the primary faculties of the human soul ; disbelief in the capability of man's reason to discriminate between truth and error in all departments of knowledge, sacred and profane," etc.—will not receive the doctrine of the Kingdom, because they, *disliking the requirements attached to it,* assign to humanity the capacity of working out its own destiny and of becoming its own Saviour through the mediumship of reason. The Kingdom, together with the Theocratic King so mercifully provided, will be to them a source of ridicule and contempt, a return to "the error" of the Primitive Church and "to cast off Jewish forms," because reason—*rejecting the authority of God's Word, refusing to regard the Divine Purpose as a grand whole, declining to consider the evidences in behalf of, and the provisions made for, the Kingdom, repelling all union with co-operative faith, stubbornly resisting the conditions requisite to know practically the divine truth*—regards itself as eminently qualified to construct a plan for alleviating the sufferings and removing the evils incident to humanity. Making reason the infallible guide, man the absolute judge—only so that he is cut loose from the Scriptures as the authority—is followed, *not* by uniformity, *not* by union of plan, sentiment, etc., but by *a whirlpool* of varied opinions, making man the mere plaything of *a shifting mass* of human theories. Behold to-day the opponents of Christianity and of the Bible, and we can scarcely find two prominent leaders among them who are agreed even *in the fundamentals* of

a system, much less in the details. What reason will do, unrestrained by any authority outside of itself, uninfluenced by a purifying and self-elevating faith, is evidenced to-day by *the vast number* of theories propagated by unbelievers of all classes, forming more sects (if they may thus be named) than Christianity in its unauthorized divisions has created. While the latter have still a bond of union by their faith in and love for Christ, the former possess only a bond of affiliation in their *common dislike* to the authority of the Bible and in their *present exaltation of man.* If the believers may, by way of reproach, be designated "Bibliolaters," indicative of their profound reverence for the supreme authority of Holy Writ, surely it cannot be a matter of discredit to call the others Reason or Man-worshippers, seeing that such a phrase is expressive of the elevation of man and the praise bestowed upon him in the theories presented. In justice to another class (also divided in opinion), however, it must be added that some manifest no belief either in the Scriptures or in man; neither possess any authority, neither can produce anything to ameliorate the condition of the world; both of them are merely *the products of an irresistible destiny.* Everything is bound by unyielding Fate or by a dreamy Idealism, or by an all-devouring Pantheism, etc., but still humanity is manifesting itself, in spite of its philosophical speculations, in the utterance of yearnings that cannot be suppressed (Fichte, Goethe, etc.), and in shrinking back from its own strictly logical conclusions (as in Nihilism and Pessimism), still heart-hoping against reasoning that something better is in store for man. *There is nothing so sad under the sun as intelligence fettered by unbelief, as reason bound by pride, as the intellectual nature held irresponsive to the moral, as man attempting to stand alone without the counsel and aid of his Maker.* In looking over the writings of such, how often does the heart, knowing the truth through peaceful obedience, bleed at the utterance of longings that are irrepressible and at the expression of hopes which must forever remain unrealized, *unless a Saviour* who can control nature and nature's laws is accepted. These significant declarations are more or less common to all unbelievers in the Scriptures, showing that however they may deny the authoritative voice of God, they cannot *entirely crush* the outgoings of the nature, which God gave, after a still future good. Thus, e.g. Hennell (*An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity*, p. 489), after discarding the testimony of Scripture as unreliable, concludes by "indulging the thought that a time is appointed *when* the cravings of the heart and of the intellect will be satisfied, and the enigma of our own and the world's existence be solved." It is a remarkable feature that many in their unbelief, still holding to some First Great Cause, to an intelligent Creator, anticipate in some unexplained way a Revelation, or a manifestation, that will explain this enigma and satisfy these cravings, but they dare not enter into explanations or details, for the moment they do so, every sentence would condemn their opposition to the Bible, seeing that it would evince reliance upon, and faith in, *the Supernatural, miraculous*, etc. Tied by their own previous confessions of unbelief, an intelligently expressed faith in the divine interference in behalf of man and the exertion of creative power in removing the evils of a groaning creation, would be so hostile to their assumed position that *consistency*, if not pride, forbids its indulgence to any extent. Having given some general features pertaining to unbelief, it is unnecessary to enter into particulars or to specify the varied classes, ranging from professed Atheism to Spiritualism. The last, scorn-

ing the authority of the Bible, finds its authoritative utterances in a spirit world, given in detached and often contradictory messages, out of which a scheme promising deliverance, etc., is manufactured *very different* from the detailed Plan of the Word. Yet it concedes the Supernatural and the miraculous, in its own way, which makes it consequently *the more inexcusable and dangerous.* Inexcusable—because, admitting the necessity of aid outside of man and nature, instead of receiving that which God has provided through His Son Jesus Christ, it seeks it in spirits ; dangerous—because it draws nearer by its admissions of the Supernatural, etc., to the nature and wants of man than many other systems of unbelief do, and hence binds him the more effectually in its embraces. The characteristic common to almost all forms of unbelief is, that denying the authority of the Bible, they endeavor to find an authority *outside of it*, either in man or in nature, or in a philosophical conception of the universe, or in the invisible, unseen, spirit world. It is a serious question *how largely believers in the Word have aided* in producing such unbelief, when they have discarded reason, when eminent men have incautiously and unwarrantedly declared that no one can possibly understand the Bible without a superadded aid directly given by God. Forgetting that Revelation denotes revealed truth ; mistaking the influence of the moral upon the intellectual for the intellectual itself ; misapprehending the relationship that reason and faith must always sustain to each other ; overlooking the fact that whatever advantages and power the practical experience resulting from faith may impart, it does not close the Bible to reason—*they make the Bible a sealed book to all others but themselves.* Making the theoretical and practical identical, causing the knowledge of special truths to cover the understanding of all, they lay down *a criterion* which they themselves *constantly violate* in appealing to the reason of the unconverted and in presenting the evidences of Christianity to the disbelieving. Having treated of this feature under the Prop. pertaining to the interpretation of Scripture, it is only necessary to add, that unbelief is *not excused* by the standards set up by man, since God's appeal and commands are to each one individually (having so constructed us that every mind and heart when brought into contact with the truth will respond to it) to study His Word, not in the light of mere human interpretation, but according to the universally received principles of language. This is based upon the fact that the Bible is *designed* for all classes and conditions of men, is *adapted* for the mind and heart, and finds *a corresponding adaptation* in man, which is only true when it is studied in accordance with the laws of language with which all men are more or less conversant and under which the processes of communication, reasoning, etc. are conducted. The *simplicity* of such a procedure—a simplicity gratefully accepted by the ancient pious Jews and by the Primitive Church—*is not suited to the mystical, spiritualistic tendencies* of the age. It is too commonplace, fitted indeed for the unlearned, but scarcely accommodated to that professedly higher intelligence which seeks the transcendental, mystical, mysterious. Hence the persistent ignoring of this Kingdom—the simplicity of its government (although connected with the divine), its union with a despised nation (although its union with humanity ought to form a plea in its behalf), its provisions, design, order, establishment all referring to this world (although standing related through its Ruler to the universe)—all this is so widely different from the theorizing which undertakes, in its wisdom and sovereignty, to describe what is *expedient or proper*

for God to adopt in Redemptive purposes, that the doctrine of the Kingdom is set down, without examination, as an exploded "Jewish conception," originating in, and carried out by national prejudice and superstition.

Obs. 5. Having already alluded to the unnecessary conflict raging between science and faith; having pointed out the connection existing between reason and faith; having shown that the highest proof of divine communication in the Bible is found when that Book is approached and studied in the way science is apprehended, viz., by a strictly logical process of reasoning; having repeatedly intimated that the relationship of truth to the whole as one great system can never be satisfactorily solved by confining ourselves to one department of knowledge, or to one side of man and the world—it may be proper to notice, briefly, the charge of "*credulity*" brought against believers. Having already given the evidences, the process of reasoning, and the fundamental laws upon which our alleged "credulity" is based, it is but reasonable that we should require *the same* from our opponents. Instead of negation, assumption, hypothesis, speculation, etc., our position advances *the most positive proof* in its support by appealing *to facts* in the past and present; *facts* existing in the nature of man and of truth; *facts* appertaining to a developing Divine Purpose which in its totality, design, progress, etc., evince the intelligent guidance and control of a Creator; *facts* which when united the one to the other form a connected chain of Divine Procedure in the attainment of a definite specified Plan; *facts* too, which any one can verify by personal application of the truth; and *facts* which appertain both to reason and experience—thus manifesting the reasonableness of the same. In comparison with the deductions of science, as given by Darwinism, Büchnerism, etc., we certainly cannot be charged with "credulity," provided our deductions are reasonable. To believe that all creatures are sprung from some low form of organism, that all have their common origin in some ancient unknown formation of matter and force, that man himself is thus originated from a lower bestial form, that homologous structure and common instincts in man and lower animals necessarily prove a common descent, that mental and moral faculties were given by gradual progression, etc., etc., this certainly makes *a greater demand on faith* than the Bible statements. Dr. Dawson (before Evang. Alliance of 1873) expressed this fully: "When you talk of Darwinism you talk of theories that make *vaster demands on our faith* than on our science." We confess to incredulity in these accepted theories of natural development, when ten thousand facts multiplied by thousands exhibit its extreme ultra reasoning (as e.g. in the continued smallness of the atomical intelligent brain or head of the ant, the lack of poisonous fangs in the black-snake, etc.) based on assumptions (as e.g. hundreds of thousands of years being assumed as requisite for certain processes of development, successive formation of strata, accumulation of débris, etc., which more recently are cut down greatly in figures) founded on reasoning in a circle (as e.g. man was formed by naturally slow processes; these processes being slow, the time was necessarily great, embracing long ages, etc.), and established upon data the mere result of hypothetical speculation (as e.g. in the intervention of enormous ages between certain supposed definite periods, the origin of life, instinct, intellectuality, moral sense, etc.). Because we do not forsake the Bible with its Divinely attested Plan, and receive in its place *mere conjectural statements* from which conclusions (as

in Craniology) are drawn hostile to the Book, we are called "*credulous.*" Let it be so then, *when it is a credulity* which speaks to the heart, meeting its necessities and longings; which provides food for the intellectual and moral nature of man; which gives a Saviour in all respects adapted to the need of humanity; which supplies a Kingdom fitted to secure the blessings desired, and to remove all the evils so long deprecated, by man; which restores to us a God again dwelling with man, and brings us into intimate and endearing relationship with Himself. How much is this to be preferred *to that process of reasoning* which cannot lift us above nature; which binds us to inexorable law; which introduces us to a great "Perhaps," to a probably Intelligent, but distant, cold, and unfeeling First Cause; which seeks relief only in the comprehension of natural law and the appropriation of physical forces; which casts no light into the grave, affords no comfort to the mourner, bestows no mediation to a self-accusing moral sense, and finds the only Saviour in doomed man himself, or in enthralled nature. Which is *the most reasonable*, that which unites, or that which separates, the Creator and the created; that which makes law the final cause, or that which gives the maker of law continued power over His creatures; that which makes the being of God a great central truth, or that which continually tries to obscure it through that which is created; that which insists upon the ability of God to communicate His Will as He pleases, or that which asserts that to do so would argue imperfection; that which views man as having the capacity, intellectually and morally, to receive Divine truth, or that which makes both intellect and morality to proceed from some unknown source; that which makes man from the very constitution of his nature the subject of moral government, or that which makes him merely the creature of progressive circumstances, releasing him from moral obligations to a Higher Power; that which declares that man's necessities, subjection to evils which fall upon all alike, imperatively demands Divine assistance, or that which calls upon man to work out destiny in his own strength; that which allies the Supernatural with salvation, or that which proposes that it is not needed? Such contrasts abound and can be supplied by the reader, and a mere comparison of them will at once go far to prove *why it is* that the Bible takes such a firm hold upon even the unlettered man of faith. It is because *Divine Revelation in its adaptation to man finds a response in man's nature, need, and experience, which stamps it as God's truth.* Admitting that some are led in their opposition to the Scriptures by the fascination of some favorite theory (connected with a low view of Christianity as exemplified in history), yet of many and even partially, at least, of those just mentioned, it can be said, as Peter states (2 Pet. 3 : 5), that "*they willingly are ignorant*" of the truth as evidenced both by Creation and Redemption, and as enforced in the Bible. This is evinced by three things. First, by *the amount of faith* that is required to cover the missing links in their systems; to fill up the gaps between matter and life, and the material and intellectual; to receive the wholesale conclusions derived from the induction of a few facts; to accept of hypotheses, suppositions, conjectures, as demonstrated truths—all of which indicates such *a strain on reason*, such *a demand upon belief*, that it can only be explained, as the Bible does, on the ground that men *willingly*—as suited to their purpose—accept of it, and reject the Word as antagonistic to their claims. Secondly, by *the special delight and pains manifested* whenever it can introduce any fact or point as a departure

from Scripture, without the least regard to the faith, hopes, feelings, etc. of others, thus exhibiting a wilfulness, a hostility to Holy Writ, which by the very spirit and tenor of their writings only proves *how willing and ready they are to be ignorant* of a Word which makes such disliked (to them) practical requirements. Thirdly, by *the unwillingness* of each and every one of them—taking the explanation given by the Word of God as our guide—*to place themselves in the position* to really know and appreciate the power of the truth. Coming to the Bible with prejudice; rejecting the means of grace instituted as useless in their case; refusing to acknowledge as a primary condition the corruption of sin, and consequently the necessity of some mediation; elevating themselves into judges, instead of being impartial, teachable students; scorning to bow the knee in supplication, and to evince that humility which is a prerequisite to a fair testing of the whole truth; declining to view the Bible as containing a Plan of Redemption, and therefore to notice the perfect adaptability of it and the provisions made; confining themselves to detached portions, separated from their connection with the Divine Purpose; repelling the Saviour who (as they themselves admit—if it were true) possesses the power to save—all this certainly denotes *an unwillingness to allow the unbiassed trial* which the importance of the Book solicits. Let any one read the works that proceed from those who reject the Supernatural and miraculous in the Bible, and many sentences show forth far more than mere indifference, mere reasoning, for on the very surface appears *a delight* in being thus antagonistic, *a dislike*, and, in not a few instances, *positive detestation* of Bible statements. Even the most courteous of our opponents, who cannot, and do not, condescend to the lower gross criticism, manifest the same spirit in *the evident gratification* that their theories, hypotheses, etc. afford to them in lessening the authority of the Bible among the multitude. Flattering as this may be to the intellectual power of eminent and talented men—to the believer in the Word, it gives evidence of *a willingness*, arising from moral considerations more or less concealed, *to remain ignorant of the main proofs underlying Christianity.* Let such give us credit for *honest adherence* to the Book, and not censure our plainness of speech derived from it, if we also announce to them, that inspiration foretells, that in this conflict between unbelief and faith, between reason alone and reason and faith in harmony, between the authority of man and the authority of the Bible, etc., *the former will be triumphant.* Unbelief, led by talent, eminent ability, eloquence, etc., will gain its adherents *until they form a mighty host.* The condition of the world as delineated in the Word just previous to the Second Advent presents to us the nations *under the influence of an unbelieving Naturalism and self-glorified Humanity, arrayed in open hostility to the Lord Jesus Christ.* The Church, largely leavened with the spirit of the age, shall feel *most disastrously* the incoming flood, and the pious shall endure *the bitterness of a sifting, terrible persecution.* The picture tendered to us by faithful prophecy is *dreadful* to contemplate; for it indicates the loosening of moral obligation, the outgoing of the worst passions in man, the formation of a vast confederation to crush Christianity, and the putting forth of bloody efforts to effect its destruction. The very last words of Jesus teach us, what man will yet attempt to perform in his hatred to the Bible and its divinely appointed Saviour. Having abundantly given scriptural proof to sustain this view of the ultimate (but short-lived) triumph of infidelity

over the Church, may it not be in place to appeal to a class of opponents who engage in this work of undermining the Bible without desiring the overthrow of Christianity (which they still regard as exerting, with all its faults, a restraining moral influence), without wishing harm to society, or any member of it, without even considering the tendency of their speculations when once they fall into the hands of the masses? Those attacks, if only confined to a class of scholars, if only regarded as hypotheses worthy of consideration by the intelligent, would do comparatively little harm, but when directed by another class who advance them in *a popular form* for the multitude, they become *a destructive social power*, for the masses (caring little for scientific and philosophical reasoning) are only *too glad* to avail themselves of anything that will deliver them from *the moral and religious requirements* imposed by the Word of God, that will *excuse* the violations of the moral sense within them, and that will *palliate* in any degree their self-indulgence. The real responsibility of shaping society in this direction and of the destructive fruits resulting from it, rests upon men, who—if they ventured to accept of the experience of the past (as e.g. French Revolution, Communism, etc.), to receive the portraiture of the future as given in the Word, to weigh the inevitable fruitage that corrupt human nature will produce when fostered by a release from authority—would *themselves shrink* from their self-imposed labor. It seems to the writer that the taking away of a faith which sustains in trouble, bereavements, death, etc., without being able *to substitute anything better* (that only which cannot comfort, etc.), *is bad enough*, but in connection with this *to remove the moral restraints and responsibilities* arising from relationship to a Creator and His revealed Will, and thus making man the supreme authority—this, with the awful history of human depravity, given in the pages of history, from the earliest period to the present, *is most dangerous and ruinous* in tendency and results. Clinging to the words of the holy men of old, we must believe, that works are written, which will exert such an influence in directing the coming outburst of corruption and violence, and which will introduce by the ascendency of principles promulgated, such scenes of misery and horror that the writers, if they could foresee them, would stand aghast at the appalling spectacle and most bitterly regret their agency in creating it. Standing upon the sure prophetic Word and surveying the future, *this representation falls far short of the stern reality.* Let the sincere, candid, honest doubter read for himself the delineations given by that Word, and even the possibility of being in the remotest degree instrumental in bringing forth such a state of things will cause him to hesitate long before he will lend himself to the work. If such would consider that the Word predicts the triumph of itself, and of the Church, not through the power and labor of man, but through the power and mighty works of a Coming Redeemer (the very opposite of what man would naturally suggest if he were giving a revelation); that it makes both the Word and the Church at the last time struggling under a fiery trial from which it is delivered by the appointed Son of Man, they may *in such extraordinary announcements find a reason why the Bible is given in its present form, grandly simple and unyielding,* exhibiting traits most admirably adapted *to allow intellectual pride and presumption to stumble and fall*—forming *a pit and a snare* for the intellectual as well as the moral—in order to reveal *what is in man, and to what lengths humanity will reach in opposition to the sublimest Plan of Redemption, that*

the love and mercy of a God could furnish. If men desire to find objections to the Word, its very construction and simplicity, its ignoring of scientific and philosophical preciseness, the gradual unfolding of the Divine Plan and its details given at different periods and by various writers, etc., afford them all the opportunity needed. It is left *optional* with men to receive it as a blessing, or to convert it into a curse; *God Himself will justify it* in due time, when every jot and tittle (Matt. 5 : 18) shall be fulfilled. In the mean time the believer, sustained by "*the blessed hope*" and taught by Holy Writ, *confidently looks* for the raging flood of infidelity which shall sweep nearly all—excepting a few faithful ones—before it; which shall introduce a systematic and stern hostility provocative of martyrdom; which shall strive with fury to set aside Jesus Christ as the Redeemer of the world; and which shall be guilty of unbounded wickedness and blasphemy; but he *as confidently looks* beyond this to the sudden Coming of the glorious, mighty King of kings, when these raging waters, this destructive, persecuting career, shall be stayed; when these Antichristian hosts shall be utterly crushed; and when the foe, so jubilant and proud of numbers and fancied success, shall fall panic-stricken under the wrath of the same Lamb whose mission, sufferings, death, warnings, and entreaties they have despised.

Obs. 6. No faith, aside from other reasons, will be exercised in this Kingdom because of *the manner* of its introduction through Supernatural intervention, and of *the Personage* Jesus Christ, through whom it is to be accomplished. To the student of the Word who carefully notices *how* this Kingdom is to be re-established at the close of the times of the Gentiles, it is significant and startling to find that, *in strict correspondence with prediction,* the greatest efforts are *now made* by the Gentiles to decry the Supernatural, to cast out the miraculous, and to bring Jesus to the level of erring, weak, fate-bound humanity. Denying the power and authority of the appointed King, as a matter of course the Kingdom is also rejected, virtually saying, "*We will not have this man to reign over us.*" How can He thus come and reign when His resurrection, ascension, etc., is disbelieved; when the attributes, by which alone such a Kingdom, as covenanted and predicted, can be set up, are derided? They never consider that Jesus Christ, the God-man, must be studied in the light *of this Theocratic arrangement;* that to invalidate His claims, etc., *the Divine Plan itself,* which makes the Advent of such a Person a necessity, must be logically set aside. They never regard the historical connection existing between Jesus and the Kingdom as it once existed, and as it is now solemnly covenanted to Him as David's Son, unless it is to show (as Renan, etc.) that the Kingdom not being set up *now as predicted and believed in,* it will never be established, deliberately overlooking the passages which distinctly prove that *after* His rejection by the Jews and their conspiring to put Him to death, He proclaimed *the postponement* of the Kingdom to His Second Coming. We admit that if Jesus or His Apostles had proclaimed the establishment of the Kingdom, as covenanted immediately or shortly after His death, *then indeed* a powerful argument, owing to the patent dissimilarity between the two, would be presented, but such an establishment (which the primitive Church totally ignored) is taken *for granted,* and from a premise thus falsely grounded the most adverse conclusions respecting Jesus are entertained and promulgated. The existing facts, too, which materially aid, as parts of the Divine Purpose, to confirm such a postponement and

hence the certainty of this Coming Kingdom, are carefully avoided *and* never allowed to sustain the utterances of Jesus. A painful lack of candor toward the entire truth, a specious, unsound form of reasoning, *which takes just as much as suits its purpose and leaves out the most important in its bearing*, characterizes the attacks upon the King and Kingdom. Such a spirit and process are necessarily unproductive of faith. How largely this is chargeable to the prevailing views in the Church—equally hostile to the true notion of the Kingdom and thus making an uncalled for antagonism between covenant, prophecy, preaching, etc., and the Church—is self-evident, seeing that a large proportion of argument is derived from the unfortunate conclusions arrived at by believers. For, if the Church is the Kingdom, *then* the infidel can well say, and firmly maintain his position, *that it is not the Kingdom which was covenanted to David's Son ;* which was predicted by the prophets, preached by John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, the disciples, Apostles, and primitive Church. Logically, historically, critically, he is correct thus far ; but critically, historically, and logically he is incorrect when he *assumes* from this that it never will be verified, and from such a deduction endeavors to undermine the authority, credibility, etc., of the Redeemer. Our doctrine of the Kingdom cannot be accused of aiding and strengthening the unbelief thus manifested, for it receives the unanswerable grammatical interpretation of this Kingdom as given by eminent unbelievers, and instead of covering it up by pitiful subterfuges and lame apologies, *relies upon it as the God-given truth.* It acknowledges the propriety and the force of unbelieving argumentation respecting the preaching of this Kingdom by the Apostolic and primitive Church, and instead of making out, to the gratification of unbelief, that these ancients were entertaining a harmless and useful error, or that they were unconsciously presenting the truth in "a materialistic husk" to be developed into fruitage, *it cordially adopts and defends* this very preaching, this alleged error, *as necessitated by the oath-bound Word of God.* It admits "the Jewish conceptions" and "the Jewish expectations" incorporated with the New Test., as joyfully paraded by prominent opponents, but shows that these are *demanded* by the nature, design, and plan of the Divine Purpose. On a variety of points, our doctrine makes the concessions to infidelity which *simple justice* demands, and in so doing *gains power, consistency, and unity* which the prevailing Apologetics lack on account of their fundamental principles. Thus, e.g., we *agree* with infidelity in the principles that underlie the interpretation of the Book, viz., that it must be interpreted by the ordinary, universally received laws of language, and that when the meaning is thus obtained we are not at liberty *to substitute* another and differing sense, which is given as the taste, inclination, imagination, etc., of the interpreter may suggest. This is *fundamental ;* and unbelief has *a just right to object* to the vast number of interpretations foisted upon the Word by its constant and flagrant violation. Unbelief occupies *a proper position* when it requires that every doctrine taught by us should be found in the plain grammatical construction of the language ; it is *not wrong* when it says, that if the prophecies are truly inspired, then they cannot be conditional so far as the purpose of God is concerned ; it is *not foolish* when it proclaims that this Kingdom is Jewish—that between the apostolical belief and the one generally entertained there is a world-wide difference—that if there is any force in election the Jewish nation ought still to be an elect nation ; that the Kingdom, if manifested as the prophets describe, must

have a continued revealed Supernaturalism connected with it; that the Kingdom as predicted is associated with, even founded upon, a restored Jewish nation and its subsequent exaltation; that an intimate relationship exists between the Old and New Testaments; that in our study of the Bible we should not be fettered by the alleged authoritative utterances of our fellow-men as embraced in creeds, confessions, systems, etc. Christianity, in the controversies raging, has suffered by incorporating principles indefensible (unknown to the early Church), and by endeavoring to defend much that is utterly untenable; unbelief, only too glad to seize upon such indications of weakness, has taken advantage of the incautious and unscriptural attitude assumed, and has pressed the prevailing Theology with a line of argument that, taking the naked Scripture, is *wholly unanswerable* and but *feebly met* by those who reject the early Church doctrine of the Kingdom. This feature is beginning to be seen and felt by able writers; and it is with pleasure that we notice many of the most eminent men (as e.g. Olshausen, Lange, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Van Oosterzee, last work, etc.) falling back, more and more, to *the identical position* occupied by the early Christian Church. It is indeed *the only ground* upon which infidelity can be opposed *honorably* (i.e. without apologizing for or sacrificing the language of the Bible), and which *fairly* meets its argumentation respecting the King and the Kingdom. In this way we cannot be censurable for giving unbelief so many advantages in reasoning, and thus virtually helping it on in its efforts of destructive criticism. Admitting fully and freely the weight and authority of a certain, defined, distinctive teaching in the Bible, and which cannot possibly be denied without doing the utmost violence to the Book itself, yet the same can be proven to be—instead of hostile to the truth and the claims of Jesus—*essential to the Plan of Redemption* as developed through the Coming King and Kingdom. But relying upon the far-seeing and sure knowledge of the future as contained in this Book, it is certain that this return to the primitive faith will be accepted *by the few;* and that the protestations of these, *however logically and forcibly presented*, will utterly fail—for reasons previously given—to stem the torrent of unbelief which now receives its already swollen tributaries from all sides. God's glorious Plan for the deliverance of the world through a divinely instituted Theocratic arrangement will be rejected *by the wisdom* of the world. David's Son, so admirably qualified to bring about "the golden age" of prophecy and human longings, will be despised and treated with contemptuous scorn. Human nature will again exhibit itself in its nakedness, its inherent corruption. Analogy, pointing to the past teaching that every great providential movement in the progressive advancement of the Divine Purpose was met by a corresponding condition of unbelief, teaches that when the last, which finishes "the mystery of God," shall be made, *then it is reasonable* to anticipate a period of unbelief—and, may we add, being the final one introductory to the Kingdom itself, will be answerably great. The warning that the Apostle Paul gives to the Gentiles, and his portrayal of the Antichristian power that will arise before, and only to be destroyed at, the Personal Advent; the fearful portraiture of the corruption of mankind just previous to the Advent like in the days of Noah and Lot (Matt. 24 : 39, "*knew not* until the flood came," etc.) making a divine personal interference imperative; the openly hostile attitude of the nations, the exaltation of reason and humanity, the oppressed condition of the pious, the lamentable state of the Jewish nation, the formation of a vast

confederation and its merciless acts toward witnesses of the truth ; and all this at the closing of this dispensation *evinces such a state of unbelief,* such a fruitage of the seeds now sown broadcast in a too favorable soil, such a continuation and powerful development of infidelity, such a turning away from God's Redemptive Purpose in Christ Jesus and trust in humanity, that it is impossible to entertain any other opinion, *consistent with faith in the Word,* than that, whatever may be said in defence of the truth, men will resist it and gain adherents until the time arrives for a violent outburst engendering a revolution *most disastrous to the Church, most ruinous to the moral interests and eternal welfare of the multitude* swayed by it, and *most fatal* to those who shall in that day venture to testify in behalf of the truth. Indeed, so fully persuaded is the writer of *the certainty* of this—judging simply from past and present fulfilment—that the hope of writing for that very period—of warning the weak in faith not to yield, of encouraging the believing to suffer and endure to the end, of cautioning the doubting how to decide, and of admonishing all, friends and foes, what they must expect —has *greatly sustained* him in his labor.

PROPOSITION 181. *Our doctrinal position illustrated and enforced by the Parable of the Ten Virgins.*

In view of the important teaching of this parable, it deserves, however occasionally mentioned under several Propositions, special consideration, seeing how strongly it corroborates our doctrinal conclusions.

Obs. 1. The linking of the parable by the word "then" to the preceding context, and the tenor of the parable itself, has led a multitude of able writers, including our opponents, to interpret it as illustrative of the attitude of the Church at the Sec. Advent. Consistency forces such an application because of the express mention of the Sec. Advent (Matt. 24 : 30, 31), and the admonitions and warnings to be watchful adjoined (vs. 32–51), so that the parable itself is properly regarded as illustrating and enforcing the previously given instruction. The succeeding context, in the parable of the talents, and in the judgment of the nations, warns us in reference to the ultimate reward dispensed at the Sec. Advent. The context, therefore, as well as the parable, enforces the importance and duty of watchfulness and faithfulness.

Our opponents concede this teaching and application. Thus e.g. Brown (*Com.* Matt. 25 : 1) says on "then" : "At the time referred to, at the close of the preceding chapter ; the time of the Lord's Second Coming to reward His faithful servants and take vengeance on the faithless." Neander (*Life of Christ*, sec. 258) admits that it "was designed to set vividly before the disciples the necessity of constant preparation for *the uncertain time* of Christ's Sec. Advent." Barnes (*Com. loci*) says : "The meaning is, when the Son of Man returns to judgment, it shall be as it was in the case of ten virgins in a marriage ceremony." "The circumstances of the parable do not seem at all to apply to His Coming to destroy Jerusalem, but are aptly expressive of His Advent to judge the world." Lisco (*On the Parables*, p. 180) makes the "train of thought in the parable" to be, "the proper preparation for the Advent of our Lord." So Lange (*Com. loci*) says : "The leading idea is the readiness of the Church for the Coming of the Lord ;" and (p. 447) holds that the parable must be placed at the beginning or ushering in of the thousand years. (Comp. Alford, Greswell, Olshausen, Bengel, etc.)

Obs. 2. The application of it, therefore, to the Romans at the destruction of Jerusalem, to death, to divine providence, etc., is foreign to the intent of the parable. The previous references to the Coming of "the Son of Man" (expressive of personal humanity), the manner of His Coming (sudden and unexpected, etc.), the time of His Coming (as in the days of Noah), the translation united with it (one taken and the other left), the power and glory, the angels connected with it, the gathering of the elect, the fate of the unwatchful—all as well as the succeeding ones, show that *the same future Advent* so repeatedly mentioned afterward and embodied in the expressed faith of the Church, is the one intended.

This application of the parable by Universalists and others, if legitimately carried out (as e.g. in Elihu Burritt, etc.), would give us no personal Sec. Advent in the future. Not only the general scope and design forbid it, as seen in the subject-matter preceding and the declaration subjoined, but the universal opinion of the quite early Church, having the advantage of nearness to inspired guidance, repudiate such engrafted meanings. The most varied expositions are given by some in order to get rid of a future personal Sec. Advent. Portions of it are used on funeral occasions to illustrate sudden death, and the Coming of the Son of Man, the Bridegroom, is made, not a "blessed hope" but penal in its nature (comp. Prop. 121). One of the harshest interpretations is that of Dr. Rutter (Rom. Cath.) in his *Life of Jesus*, p. 420, for while retaining the future Sec. Advent, he makes the slumbering (drowsiness) of the virgins to be "sicknesses," and the sleeping to be "death;" the cry is the last trumpet waking the dead; preparing the lamps is passing in review their actions, and the oil represents good works, etc.—an interpretation violating the scope of the parable, making none living at the Sec. Advent. It is derived from Chrysostom, Basil, Hilary, etc., and has been adopted by Wordsworth and a few modern writers.

Obs. 3. In the interpretation of the parable, its parabolic form must constantly be observed; and hence not every particular expression, introduced to fill out the figure or image introduced, is to be pressed to denote a corresponding relationship in the Church or future.

The violation of this principle, and applicable to parables generally, has led to fanciful explanations, an accumulation of resemblances not intended, accommodations not within the design. To illustrate: Luther (*Misc. Sermons*, 18, 36), speaking of the foolish having no oil and going to purchase it, says: "Wherefore do they not cry to the bridegroom that they have no oil? Why do they run to their fellows for oil? The cause is that they have never truly known the bridegroom, otherwise they would run to him." Now such an application is a violation of the marriage customs in vogue, and was not designed; the language accords with the usage of the day and simply illustrates the unpreparedness of the foolish virgins. So much stress is laid on the "lamps," "the oil," the "midnight cry," the "slumbering and sleeping," and exact resemblances are sought out, and insisted on, when the imagery of the parable derived from the prevailing customs demands such an introduction in order to more clearly illustrate the leading idea intended, viz., the utter unpreparedness of some for the sudden Coming of the Master, and hence the necessity of looking for the same with constant preparation. If every part of the imagery, designed simply to illustrate and enforce a leading idea or ideas, is to be pressed to find an analogy, confusion and diversity (comp. Lange's *Com. loci*) must ensue, as fancy or imagination may frame analogies.

Obs. 4. This parable is prophetic, being designed to express and enforce the future unexpected (because not exactly known) Coming of the great Bridegroom, the certainty of that Coming although delayed, the condition of certain parties at His Advent, and the result to themselves arising from the state in which they are found.

The leading idea as Lange (*Com.*) remarks, is readiness for the Coming of the Lord, and Dr. Schaff correctly points to verse 13, which contains the lesson of the parable, confirming this view. So e.g. Barnes (*Com.*) remarks: "Circumstances in parables are not to be pressed literally. They are necessary to keep up the story, and we must look chiefly or entirely to the *scope or design* of the parable to understand its meaning. In this parable the scope is to teach us to *watch* or be ready, v. 13."

Obs. 5. The force of the illustration can only be properly appreciated by the consideration of the truth which it is designed to confirm, and of the custom from whence it is derived. The doctrine to be enforced is, as the context shows, *the future Coming* of the Son of Man, who will come at a time when persons *will not look for Him*, because the exact time, the day and hour, is not known, and hence the caution (Matt. 24 : 42), "*Watch*

therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." The custom from whence the parable is taken, was one familiar to the East. Jesus selects a particular time in the marriage ceremonial, to illustrate the uncertainty of His Coming, and the consequences of heeding or not heeding the cautions He already had given respecting it. It is the time *after* the wedding at the house of the bride's parents (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 161, Barnes's *Com. loci*, Lisco's *On the Parables*, p. 183, *Encyclop. Relig. Knowl.*, art. "Mar. Ceremony," Smith's *Dic. Bible*, Meyer's *Com.* etc.), and *after* the wedding festival there (which lasted several days—we are told seven for a maid and three for a widow), when the bridegroom, with the nuptial guests, conducts the bride to his own house or to that of his father, that is chosen.[1] The procession generally started in the evening or night with great pomp, having torches, songs, and music. This company with the bridegroom, was met by another, friends of the bridegroom and bride, which, at or near the bridegroom's house, waited, ready at the first notice of approach to go forth, meet the procession, unite with it, enter the house, and participate in the entertainment or marriage supper. This last company not knowing precisely the hour or time when the procession would come, made preparation and watched for its arrival, so that it could enter in with the bridal party—its union with the other and privilege of admittance, being indicated by the bearing of lamps, or burning torches, thus showing that they were friends, and as such could properly be admitted as guests at the marriage feast. After the procession entered the house with those who actually participated in the escort and manifested their friendship and respect for the bridegroom and bride, the door was shut and admittance refused. Now Jesus takes this parabolic representation from actual life, and shows from *the uncertainty* of the bridegroom's arrival and *the preparedness* of the company awaiting him, *how* it will be (as the word "then" implies) at His future Advent, and, consequently, enjoins watchfulness.[2]

[1] Some of the versions expressly indicate the time. Thus the Syriac, Vulgate, Coptic, the Cranmer Bible, and also Van Ess, Alioli, Knapp, three MSS., etc., read, "the Bridegroom *and the Bride.*" This, of course, locates the period to be when the Bridegroom is going to His own house with the Bride. So also Trench, *On the Parables*, Maldonatus, etc.

[2] It is significant that Jesus does not take the bridegroom and his friends as they proceed to the wedding, but in coming from the wedding, which is fully enforced by Luke 12 : 35–38, "Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men *that wait for their Lord, when He shall return from the wedding;* that, when He cometh and knocketh, they may open unto Him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when He Cometh shall find watching; verily I say unto you, that He shall gird Himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if He shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants." This then, while the main idea of watchfulness is of general application (as the context and analogy of Scripture show), is specially designed for a class of persons who await the Lord's return from the wedding. Who these are will appear. Some assume a "modification of the usual custom and a procession of the virgins to meet the bridegroom on his way to the house of the bride." But this is against the general usage (comp. Trench, *Notes on the Parables*), Lange's *Com. loci* says: "It was the custom among the Jews and Greeks that the bridegroom accompanied by his friends, went to the house of the bride to lead her to his own house, and was joined by the virgins, the friends of the bride, not on his going to fetch the bride, but on his returning with her to his own house." (Comp. De Wette, Meyer, Lightfoot, Wetstein, etc.). Such a custom prevails even to this day in Sicily (Hughes's *Travels in Sicily*, vol. 2, p. 20). Hence it is that some of the old readings add to the first verse "and the bride," which Trench (*On Par.*, p. 237) thinks the sense requires.

Obs. 6. The parable being *prophetic,* and thus delineating what shall truly take place *when* the Lord Jesus shall return from the wedding, it must accord fully, be in perfect agreement, with all the other predictions relating to the subject. The unity of the Word, the integrity of Scripture, the truthfulness of Jesus as a Teacher, demand such a harmony. It must, e.g. accord with Rev. 19, in which is foreshown that the marriage of the Lamb, and the calling to the marriage supper, is something that appertains to His Sec. Advent and the commencement of His glorious reign on earth. But it must do more than this ; it must correspond not merely to the general statements on the subject, but to the exact order of fulfilment pertaining to that future period. Thus it has been shown (Prop. 130) that the Second Advent, like the First, is expressive of a period of years ; that its beginning is characterized by a thief-like, concealed Coming and its end by an open Advent. The question, therefore, is *with which stage* of the Advent does the parable best correspond? To this there can be but one answer : it pertains to the last stage, the open parousia. Let the following considerations be regarded. (1) It does not relate to the thief-like Coming because that period, and the events connected therewith, do not correspond with the parable in the following particulars : (*a*) There is no public Coming of the Bridegroom with open pomp and splendor ; (*b*) the resurrection of the first-fruits and the sudden translation of the little flock do not accord with such a public manifestation being secret and invisible in their nature ; (*c*) there is no return from a wedding, the first stage preceding it ; (*d*) believers in Jesus do not at that time all even profess to look for the Advent, much less go forth to meet the Bridegroom—the great lack of faith evidencing the contrary ; (*e*) the midnight cry (however applied by some to the past and the present) has not been sounded, as shown by its effects *both on the wise and the foolish* virgins, who recognized it, and all arose and trimmed their lamps, and it will not be true at this stage that the cry, "Behold the Bridegroom Cometh" will cause *all believers,* wise and foolish, to arise and indicate a looking for the Bridegroom, as seen e.g. in the predictions relating to the faithlessness of the Church ; (*f*) the cry is *not raised* by any of these virgins, for it comes outside of them, and hence the incongruity of persons representing themselves to be "wise virgins" and raising the cry, whom the Saviour represents with the foolish to be drowsy and asleep, being themselves aroused by the cry ; it follows that the illustration does not fit the particulars of the first stage ; (*g*) the parable does not express the condition of the Church in general as composed of believers and mere professors, or of two parties, but the image is drawn from a party who expected the coming of the bridegroom (took their lamps *and went forth to meet* the bridegroom"), made preparation for his coming (with lamps and oil in them), and when his coming was announced acted in response *to their previous expectation* ("*then all those* virgins arose and trimmed their lamps"), and simple analogy requires that it should be fulfilled in such a body of persons. (2) But it does apply forcibly to the second stage of the Advent and to the events connected therewith as predicted : (*a*) the open parousia of Jesus with His saints is *after* the wedding (Prop. 166) at Mt. Sinai—the figure of marriage (Prop. 169) being used to indicate the intimate Theocratic relationship of the saints with the King, or the inauguration of the saints there as co-kings and co-priests with Him in His Kingdom ; (*b*) the procession of the bridegroom *after* the wedding to his own house to have the marriage publicly consummated by a marriage

supper, finds *its exact parallel* in Jesus Coming with His saints and the holy angels from the celebration of a Theocratic inauguration at Mt. Sinai; (*c*) the bridegroom comes after the wedding to his own house, and his friends *await him* there to receive the procession and participate in the proposed marriage feast, finds *its precise fulfilment* in Jesus, after the Theocratic ordering instituted at Mt. Sinai, taking His course to His own inheritance, to Jerusalem, where He meets a body of His "own" people; (*d*) those who thus waited *all professed* affection for the bridegroom, and thus this remnant of Jews, after experiencing the merciless persecution of the last Antichrist (whom they as a body had received in preference to Jesus) which restores them earnestly and longingly to the nation's hope of Messianic deliverance (as evidenced by the cordial manner in which they hail His Coming and yield obedience), turn their minds (influenced by Elijah) to a looking and waiting for the Messiah; (*e*) those who wait expect the coming of a bridegroom (not themselves to be the bride) and a participation in the marriage feast in the bridegroom's inheritance, which indicates a marked change in their views (i.e. of the Jews), viz., that the terrible persecution endured, the proclamation of the truth by the Christian Church during the interval, the precise realization of the prophetic announcements in their own experience, the culmination of their tribulation as foreshown by the Spirit in connection with Jesus of Nazareth, has at length caused this remnant at Jerusalem to decide favorably to Jesus of Nazareth, and to await His Coming as the promised One, even as the bridegroom; (*f*) the entering in with the bridegroom and participating in the marriage festivities, finds *a precise fulfilment* in the announced predictions that the Jews shall at the personal Coming of Jesus experience the special favor of the Messiah, and be restored to Theocratic nearness to God, having an assured supremacy over the nations; (*g*) the reception of some and the rejection of others, owing to that of preparation and attitude occupied, finds *its exact parallel* in the verifications of the predictions that a portion of the Jews will be accepted and another portion be rejected—that a sifting and separation will ensue; (*h*) the midnight cry, uttered by the escort with the bridegroom's procession or by believing Gentiles, so arrests the attention of the Jews, that they, in their extremity, begin to believe in Him whom they have pierced, exemplified by their willingness then to accept of Him; (*i*) the posture occupied by the virgins is indicative of a belief in a Coming, expected Messiah, and this is in accord with the Jewish position then occupied, for seeing the accurate fulfilment in the distress accumulated upon them by the last Antichrist, they will also believe in the promised deliverance (as e.g. shown in Zech. 14), and some will be suitably prepared (morally) while others will neglect preparation; (*j*) the prophecy preceding (comp. Mark 13 and Luke 21) had a special mention of the Jewish nation, of its long-continued tribulation, etc., and it is reasonable that in the final result Jesus should illustrate *the condition* of the Jews, addressing Himself to them; (*k*) the Second Advent of the Messiah has a twofold specific relationship, as previous Propositions unfold, viz., first, to the Church which is associated with Him in the highest Theocratic relationship, in rulership, etc.; and second, to the Jewish nation which occupies a subordinate, but as to other nations a supreme, Theocratic position; in view of this, it is reasonable to suppose that the duty of watching and being prepared would be enjoined upon both; (*l*) the virgins are invited guests, specially called to participate in the mar-

riage feast ushering in the Millennial era, and so numerous predictions call and invite the Jews to that "feast of fat things," and we are assured of a response; (*m*) the virgins who joined the bridal procession evidently congratulated the bridegroom on his marriage and expressed their wishes in his behalf and that of the bride, as implied by their attitude, by honoring the coming with their union with it, etc., and this finds a realization in the joy of the Jews, their honoring of the Messiah, their triumph and glory at the open Parousia of Jesus, the Christ; (*n*) the time of Christ's Coming, at "midnight," i.e. at the very close of this dispensation, just when the glorious "day of the Lord Jesus" is to be ushered in, with which "day" the Jews, as we have shown, are inseparably connected, in view of their covenanted Theocratic relationship.

Other points might be presented, but we doubt the propriety—as already expressed—of pressing every part of the parable. That "they all slumbered and slept" is certainly not taken in a bad sense (as some suppose, who make it to denote being "cold and careless," "careless and insensible," "diminution of watchfulness, fervor and activity," "spiritual declension," or even "pre-occupied with the secular pursuits of life," "engrossed with pleasures and cares," etc., for this would prove too much for their own application, showing that no one—*for all slept*—watched for the coming of the bridegroom), because the Saviour does not censure them for being asleep, a natural result of long waiting, but for the lack of *previous* preparation, so that they were not ready when the bridegroom, whom they *all* anticipated, came. The imagery is drawn from actual life and natural sleep is not rebuked in the wise or the foolish, but the lack of oil, the neglect in laying in a suitable supply. Therefore the sleeping is not censured, and the reason lies in the simple fact that the figure is derived from *what actually transpired* in usage at so long a delay, viz., when the parties had made suitable preparation, if the bridegroom was long delayed, they then deemed it not unsuitable, in view of their subsequent wakefulness at the coming of the bridegroom in the lengthy festivities, to snatch a little refreshing sleep. The watching that the Saviour inculcates is not a self-denial of natural sleep—required to repair our strength—but a state of the mind which *anticipates* the Advent and makes *previous preparation* for it. If an analogy should be pressed, then it might resolve itself simply in weariness and flagging of interest at the long delay. Storr (*Diss. on Parables*) says that the sleeping of the wise virgins is "introduced not as a defect in the wise virgins, who, on the contrary, are an example of vigilance and prudent circumspection; but on account of its being necessary to the order of the narrative." It evinces the extreme carelessness of the foolish, who deemed their preparation ample enough for the occasion. Trench also (to which Nast, *Com.* is inclined) regards the falling asleep a circumstance required by the parabolic narration. To make this sleeping the universal condition of the Church (as some do because all slept) at the period of the first stage of the Advent, is virtually to declare that none are then found occupying the posture of watching, which is forbidden by declarations and the translation of the watching; if thus applied to the Church during the interval between the two stages, it is also forbidden by the preaching during the interval, the resistance against the Antichrist even to death, the multitude that come out of the great tribulation, etc. Dr. Seiss (*Parable of the Ten Virgins*, p. 41) makes the sleeping to be that "their enthusiasm on the near Advent of their Lord had abated. Their expectation had lost its ardor." To bring out an analogy, he has recourse to a history of our doctrine, its decline and revival, thus making the parable illustrative not of the period "then" to which it refers, but of the entire period of the Church's history. Our view avoids this, and other (as midnight cry, by whom given?) incongruities.

Obs. 7. This application is enforced by considering the stress of "*then*" as connected with the preceding context. The Saviour *had just referred* to the translation (which we, Prop. 130, locate at the first stage of the Advent), and to the cutting off of the unfaithful and unwatching from the portion of those who look for the Coming and are prepared, and the natural conclusion follows: "then," that is, after this removal and judgment, then shall follow the realization of this illustration.

Able writers, as Dr. Seiss (*Last Times*, Ap. to last Ed., p. 351), Rev. Reineke (*Proph. Times*, vol. 9, p. 46), and others, take the position that the parable will only be verified at the open, revealed Parousia, or last stage of the Advent, although they apply it to the Church in general. This reference to the Church at that period might be consistently allowed, if it were not, in view of the reasons assigned, more natural to apply it to the people addressed. The mention of "virgins" upon which so much emphasis is laid, is simply a part of the parabolic dress, being actually derived from the customs existing, viz., that maidens thus met, in compliment, the bridegroom and bride. For although thus designated, a part of them were foolish; the simple idea being that just as such a party on such an occasion, were *prepared and unprepared so it will be again* at this period. There is danger in pressing every particular, and even the persons designated in the parable, as seen e.g. in the parable of the unjust judge. So in reference to "the lamps" and "the oil" which are supposed by many to find their exact fulfilment in profession and grace, they are only introduced (as seen e.g. in the recommendation to the foolish to go *to the oil merchants* to buy) to fill out the imagery of the custom, and bring forth the fact of preparation and the lack of it. The number "ten" is still more applicable to the Jew than to the Church, seeing (Lange's *Com. loci*) that "ten formed a company with the Jews, also a family to eat the passover; ten Jews living in one place formed a congregation and should be provided with a synagogue; ten lamps or torches were the usual number in marriage processions." The main idea, however, that some would be prepared and others unprepared for this Coming is to be pressed.

Obs. 8. If it were allowable to read in the first verse, "And went forth to meet the bridegroom and the bride" (as Maldonatus and others, and decidedly favored by Trench, *Notes on the Parables*, p. 237), it would confirm our view. However this may be, it is certain, from the usage referred to, that these virgins join the procession *on the return of the bridegroom with the bride* to their future abode (Obs. 5 and note). This accords with the previous withdrawal of the 144,000 (Prop. 130), with the Theocratic marriage at Mt. Sinai (Prop. 166), and with the procession of the bridegroom and bride to their future glorious abode on Mt. Zion. This agrees with the simple fact that these virgins, prepared to unite and enter into the marriage supper, are, *not the bride, but guests* who honor the bridegroom and the bride—virgins who follow the queen.

This distinction between the bride and these virgins who are guests, is observed by numerous writers (as e.g. Steir, Seiss, Alford, etc.). Dr. Schaff in Lange's *Com. loci* remarks: "According to the Millenarian theory the bride is the restored Jewish Church and the ten virgins represent the Gentile congregations accompanying her." And he favors some such distinction, saying: "We may perhaps say that she is here, in the strict interpretation, *the Jewish Church* and these ten virgins *Gentile* congregations accompanying her." It may be repeated that, whatever explanation is given, the bride is *separate and distinct from those invited guests*. For usage compels us, as well as the analogy of Scripture on the point, to make such a discrimination. Hence on the phrase "*went in with Him to the marriage.*" Barnes (*Com.*) remarks: "The marriage *ceremony* took place before the bride left her Father's house, but a feast was given at the house of her husband, and which was also called *the marriage*, or a part of the marriage solemnities." In the *Truth*, vol. 3, No. 9, Dr. Brookes makes the bride to be "the redeemed and restored Israel," and the virgins to be the entire number of Gentile converts which follow her, as illustrated in Ps. 45. But all such methods to solve the difficulty and to avoid making the Church *both* to represent the bride and the guests, are arbitrary, since, as we have shown under former Propositions in detail, the Gentile converts *are not* a separate body to occupy a lower position, but are engrafted into the Israel and shall obtain with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob the highest Theocratic position.

Obs. 9. The personality of the Sec. Advent is decidedly implied and enforced by the parable. The previous and succeeding context clearly teaches it, and the parable is expressly designed to illustrate what will occur, in relation to certain parties, at its realization. The coming of the

bridegroom and bride is personal, the entire imagery is realistic in the marriage, etc., and the simple fact that Jesus selects the same *as illustrative* of His own Coming, abundantly confirms our position, and shows that the same is Pre-Millenarian.

Obs. 10. "The Kingdom of heaven" is thus likened. That is, the Kingdom of heaven *in its manner* of introduction or realization will meet with such a reception, or bring forth such a result. The covenanted Messianic Kingdom, as we have in detail proven, pertains to the period of this Sec. Advent, and will meet *such a reception* by the Jews, some being prepared and others unprepared.

Obs. 11. In reference to the mooted point whether the foolish virgins are wicked, ungodly, mere professors (or, as some even designate them, "hypocrites," etc.), or merely inconsiderate, lacking forethought; if we were to allow the particulars of the parable to have any force, then certainly the foolish virgins cannot be regarded as wicked, much less as hypocrites, or mere professors. For they go out, as friends or invited guests, to meet the bridegroom; they also have lamps which contained some oil; with the wise they awaited the Coming, and with them they slept; when they found that not a sufficiency of oil had been previously provided, they were solicitous to repair their error, and actually (for they went to buy and then returned) did furnish their lamps with oil (which, if it denotes "grace," etc., shows their moral condition), but too late. The only marked difference between the two classes consisted in this: the wise with the oil in their lamps took oil *in vessels with them* to give a needed supply; the foolish neglected this precaution, and hence were not ready. The foolish, therefore, are only excluded from these marriage festivities, but will ultimately be saved.

The writer is forced by the parable itself, and the general analogy of the Word on this point, to accept of the view held by Alford (who also lays stress on the present tense: "they are going out," showing that the lamps had oil, but not a sufficiency), Olshausen, Poiret, Fr. Von Meyer, Rudolph, Stier, Bayford, Seiss, and others, viz., that the five foolish virgins will only be excluded from the special blessings connected with this marriage feast, seeing that they are not divided into good and bad, or into believers and unbelievers; and it is not said that the foolish virgins could not purchase any oil, but we are left rather to the conclusion that as they went to buy, they secured it *although too late.* This application is resisted, on the other hand, by able writers. Thus e.g. Dr. Brookes (*The Truth*, vol. 3, No. 9) regards it as "a dangerous speculation," etc., because we are not to allow the five foolish virgins to have been believers, having a mere lifeless wick and no oil; being designated "foolish;" also, the "door shut," and the bridegroom saying, "I know you not." He deprecates mere human opinion, when he certainly advances the same, by asserting, over against the parable, that they were no believers—when *faith* in the coming bridegroom caused them to go forth to meet him—that they had a lifeless wick—when the lamp *had been burning* until midnight—that they had no oil—when the lamps were *not out but merely going out*, needing replenishing, and they went to purchase more.

Obs. 12. The "door being shut" and the declaration "I know you not," are, therefore, simply expressive of exclusion *to a position* which the others, because of their preparation and readiness, obtain. It is a fact, as we have previously shown, that the faithful children of Abraham, including the engrafted and adopted Gentile believers, shall through the power of resurrection and translation at the first stage of the Advent be associated with

the Christ as co-heirs or rulers in the Theocratic ordering (this, owing to the intimate, endearing, and enduring relationship being also represented as a marriage). To this marriage the Jewish nation is specially invited under the figure of guests ; and those who at its inauguration will accept of the invitation and qualify themselves by a previous preparation, *shall also be particularly associated and honored.* These filling the stations allotted to them in the Kingdom, no others can be admitted, however they may afterward enjoy the peace, prosperity and blessedness brought about by the dominion and supremacy exercised. The period of the inauguration and manifested establishment of the Kingdom, is one also in which those will be honored who honor Jesus the Christ.

Attention is invited to the parable of the marriage of the king's son (Matt. 22 : 1–14) in its contrast to this one, and yet teaching precisely the same result. Here the door was shut and no one could enter unless he had a burning lamp ; there even one was found who had not on a wedding garment, but he only entered the outer apartment or one separated from the room where the marriage feast was given, where the scrutiny was undergone. So that, so far as the feast was concerned, " the door was shut" to him likewise ; and this, too, took place (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 162) " *after* the procession in the evening from the bride's house was concluded." Both refer to *the same period* and to *a certain qualification* needed in order to participate in the marriage festivities. But the latter introduces some very significant features, such as the invitation to the Jewish nation to enter into the Theocratic relationship (marriage of the Son) for the Kingdom was tendered to them ; the refusal of the nation to accept of the same ; the destruction of the murderers and burning up of their city ; the call of the Gentiles ; and then, at *the time of the marriage* the scrutiny of invited guests reveals one utterly unprepared and who is rejected, thus in a parabolic manner exhibiting the fate of a certain class, who at the time of marriage festival shall be considered entirely unworthy—because in no sense honoring the occasion, but showing manifest disrespect—of participation in it. The same idea of sifting is presented, and some manifest inconsiderateness, making no suitable preparation, and are excluded, while others exhibit positive disrespect and are cut off. The lack of faith, resulting in lack of moral qualifications essential to a participation in Messianic blessedness, is evidently presented.

Obs. 13. The midnight cry is one that arose not *before* the wedding, but *after ;* not *before* the procession had started, but *after ;* not *before* the very last period, but *just when expiring.* It therefore cannot possibly be applied as many now do, viz., to the past and present condition of the Church, some arising and specifically directing attention to the Sec. Advent, seeing that the cry as located in the parable with the bridal procession forbids it.

Besides this. the parable shows that when the cry was raised, both wise and foolish were aroused by it and acknowledged that Coming, etc., which is not true of any warnings uttered by Pre-Millenarianism, Millerism, etc. Indeed, before the first stage of the Advent it could not possibly be applied, as the Church is represented as faithless, etc., on the subject. It pertains to *the interval* between the two stages, when these virgins recognize this marriage, acknowledge their relationship to the bridegroom and bride (as predicted), and then, just when the bridal procession is to be awaited, anticipate its coming. It represents an occurrence at a specified time, viz., when the bridegroom returns from the wedding, and we cannot, in consistency with the decisive representation of the parable, antedate its utterance. The cry itself does not, as claimed, come *from the wise virgins ;* they themselves are aroused by it. It proceeds either from heralds preceding the procession, or from the procession itself, or else from Gentiles. The most probable opinion, however, is that it proceeds from Elijah, who (as we show elsewhere in detail) is specially sent to the Jews during this interval to prepare them for the open Parousia. The interval itself, as we have contended, is not a brief period, but may extend to fifty, seventy-five, or more years, and its extent (after the capture, etc. of the city by Antichrist, Zech. 14) serves to explain the delay intimated in the parable.

Obs. 14. The precise time of the open Parousia, the Epiphany, is unknown, just as the thief-like Coming is unknown as to exact time. The determinate duration *of the interval* is something that belongs to God alone. Approximately, as the virgins themselves did, we may conclude its approach to be near. The attitude, professions, etc., of the virgins indicates this, while the precise time of the manifestation was something which they did not know. Hence the express caution annexed : "*Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour, wherein the Son of Man cometh.*"

The caution here is of general application, and, in view of its decisive language, is certainly opposed to that *dogmatic* mathematical calculation which would determine not only the exact time of the thief-like stage, but also the precise duration of the interval. While all such chronological estimates may serve to give an approximative idea of nearness, on the other hand the confident and positive exhibitions of time are opposed to the caution of Jesus. The very uncertainty of the Coming is made the reason why watchfulness and due preparation should be preserved. The conclusion of the parable (v. 13) is, therefore, of general, present application ; while specially to be realized in the manner stated, the caution embraces the Advent as a whole, being comprehensive in its meaning. Hence the application of the past in enforcing the constant duty of watching for the Advent, is correct in view of the summing up of the duty thus enjoined, requisite to both of the stages of the Advent.

Obs. 15. The parable enforces our position that there will be no conversion of the world prior to the Sec. Advent. The condition of the virgins, the division into prepared and unprepared, the reception of one class and rejection of the other, even at the closing period (midnight), all indicates that "all are not righteous," etc. It evidences that even in reference to the Jews, God's own covenanted people, there will be a period of sifting—as often predicted—in order to determine who are worthy of participating in the glorious marriage festival.

Obs. 16. No matter whether this parable be interpreted as applying to the Church at the first stage of the Sec. Advent, or to the same at the last stage, or to the Jews at the open, manifested parousia as distinguished from the previous thief-like Coming, it corroborates and enforces our doctrine respecting the attitude of watchfulness and preparation for the Sec. Advent, the certainty and personality of that Coming, and the blessed results flowing to the righteous from that Advent. Whatever our views may be respecting it in detail, yet the leading ideas are so unmistakably given that we cannot mistake.

Hence, while differing in the details and the application of a portion of the parable, the Pre-Millenarian aspect of it is decided, and the constant duty of watchfulness is enforced by all writers. The concluding verse agrees with the general analogy on the duty of looking for the Coming of the Saviour. Dr. Seiss (*Par. Ten Virgins*, ch. 6), and others ably present this feature, urging an efficient preparation. Both the thief-like stage and the open Parousia demand this attitude and qualification. The special favor and blessing of the Son of Man, the glorious Theocratic King, can only be secured by the acceptance of His instructions, and a manifested obedience to the same.

PROPOSITION 182. *This Kingdom embraces the "One Hope."*

Our argument presents the "*One Hope*" (Eph. 4 : 4), that actuated the ancient worthies, the pious Jews at the First Advent, the disciples, apostles, and early believers, and many an humble believer down to the present day. This hope is *continuously expressed* not only in this, but in the preceding dispensation. Abraham "believed in hope" (Rom. 4 : 18) and so do his seed ; a hope expressed in the covenants, reiterated by the prophets, renewed by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and preached by the apostles ; a hope centred in God (Jer. 14 : 8 and 17 : 7, 13, etc.), manifested in Jesus (1 Tim. 1 : 1 ; Col. 1 : 27 ; 1 Thess. 1 : 2, 3, etc.), and wrought by the Spirit (Rom. 15 : 13).

Hence the reason why the intelligent believer so earnestly desires (2 Pet. 3 : 12) and ardently prays (Luke 18 : 1–8) for the Advent and deliverance. For as Seiss (*Par. Ten Virgins*, p. 150) says : "As Christians, set to be and to do all that we can for ourselves and that Redeemer who has bought us with His blood, His return was never meant to be a terror to us, *but a joy and the essence of our gladdest hope.* That day is to be *our happiest day*—the day when all present woes and disabilities shall cease—the day of release from servitude and toil, the day of return from exile and privation, the day of triumph and everlasting jubilee, the day when our Saviour will take us to Himself, to be with Him and like Him forever."

Obs. 1. Much vagueness exists among believers at the present day in reference to this Hope, owing to the simple fact that the announcement of this Hope (as e.g. by the angel, Luke 1 : 32, 33) is spiritualized or explained away, and *something else substituted* in its place. Hence it is that we are taught, that in order to appreciate this Hope we must be enlightened ; Eph. 1 : 18, "*the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, that ye may know what is the Hope of His calling and what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints,*" etc. This opening of the eyes of the understanding only comes *from a searching* of the Scriptures. Enlightenment is necessary (hence the caution is given, as if to imply a falling away from the Hope without it), because the Hope is based upon what is past, present, and future. To appreciate it intelligently the rise and progress of this Hope must be traced—its foundation in the covenants, and its confirmation by Jesus must be particularly noticed, and then the eye of faith must look onward *to the Sec. Advent* for its realization. A portion of the Hope (also called Hope because firmly attached to it, as e.g. the resurrection, eternal life, etc.) must not be mistaken for *the whole Hope.* This caution of becoming enlightened is especially applicable to the Gentiles, to whom it is addressed, because as we have shown this is *pre-eminently* a Jewish Hope, i.e. a Hope connected with the Jewish nation, through covenants given to the Jews and through a King appertaining to them. The apostle, therefore, informs the same Ephesians (2 : 11) that, without being engrafted

into the commonwealth of Israel, becoming the seed of Abraham, they can have "*no hope.*" Our Hope is "*the Hope of Israel*" (Acts 28 : 20), "*the Hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come*" (Acts 26 : 6, 7). This Hope is embraced in the Kingdom as delineated, e.g. Isa. 9 : 7 ; Jer. 23 : 56, etc., and is reiterated in our being "called unto His Kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 1 : 12)—"the Kingdom which He has promised to them that love Him" (James 2 : 5, so inheriting, etc., comp. Luke 12 : 32 ; Matt. 25 : 34 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 11 ; Luke 13 : 29, etc.). And, as Jesus Christ is the One through whom this Hope is to be realized, He is called "*our Hope*" (1 Tim. 1 : 1) ; and as this hope is to be experienced at His Sec. Advent, His Coming is designated "*the blessed Hope*" (Tit. 2 : 13). It is highly significant, that the mighty Agent through whom Hope shall be realized is called "*the Hope,*" and if received by appropriating faith becomes "*Christ in us the Hope of glory*" (Col. 1: 27) ; but this should not prevent us from apprehending that He is only the Introducer, Verifier, Fulfiller of "*the Hope of the Gospel.*" The Gospel is "the Gospel of the Kingdom," and while it, of necessity, largely pertains to the King of the Kingdom, it is chiefly as this King shall manifest His power and glory in the Coming Kingdom as it has been covenanted and predicted.

In view of this Hope the believer can say as the Psalmist (Ps. 130 : 5, 6), or as the prophet (Isa. 25 : 9) ; but, unfortunately, comparatively few do this without spiritualizing the Hope. Many works that embrace the topic of salvation through Christ have much to say respecting present and future salvation, and give but *a small portion* of the Hope. Indeed, the most of them ignore the distinctive Hope entirely, and the covenant upon which it is based is never mentioned. While the Bible holds up to us the Coming of Jesus as "the blessed hope" of the world, by which "the hope" of the fathers relating to the Kingdom can be realized, the multitude reject this, so that even papers adopt as their title, "The Golden Age," or as their motto, "An Evangelical Ministry, an active Church, and a sanctified Press, *the Hope* of the World." Alas ! if this were our only hope. Alas ! how many hopes are substituted for the Sec. Advent and its related blessings. One has death, another the First Advent ; one has Christianity, another development ; one has the law, another the Gospel ; one has education, another humanity ; one has science, another philosophy ; one has Spiritualism, another has the Church with its sacraments ; one has some special dogma, another the progression of the Spirit, etc., so that numerous hopes are substituted for the Biblical one. It also is not observed that the Old and New Tests. are identical in, and united in, *the same Hope.* A Coming Messiah with a Coming Kingdom is the Hope of the Old and the Hope of the New, only that the Hope of the latter is confirmed and strengthened by a Messiah who has already come and departed, leaving the precious promise of a speedy return and a then incoming Kingdom. Schaff (*His. Apos. Church,* p. 604) says : "The grand theme of Old Test. prophecy is the First Coming" (we, however, would also include the Second—see Prop. 34), "that of the New Test. prophecy the Second Coming of the Lord and His Kingdom, with all the preparatory and attendant events. We expect not a Messiah as did the Jews, but the reappearing of the Lord to judge the quick and the dead, and to glorify His bride. Hence Hope is a cardinal virtue of the Church militant." The realization of Hope, as presented in the covenants and promises of salvation, is invariably linked in the Scriptures with the still future Sec. Advent of the Messiah.

Obs. 2. If we are to credit a multitude of writers, this "*One Hope*" so long entertained by God's ancient people, and which formed so remarkable a feature of the Primitive Church, and for which believers suffered even death, was *changed to another Hope.* We are gravely informed by theologians and expounders of God's Word, that the Hope, which once so continuously existed, was well enough for the age in which it was enter-

tained, but that it was *modified* to remove its "carnal" features and adapt it to "the enlightened and spiritual" age in which we live. Well may we ask, what then becomes of "*the One Hope*," and what becomes of the Hope *so fondly and passionately* embraced by the ancient believers? Our argument clearly shows, that according to the Scriptures, *no such change or modification* was ever made under divine direction, and the same is fully sustained by the history of the early Church. Men, uninspired men, led by mere reason and supposing that they could improve what Scripture so plainly has given, under the mistaken notion of elevating "the One Hope" by spiritualizing its substance, tampered with it and finally modified and so changed it, that as it appears in many works it bears *no resemblance whatever* to "the hope of the Gospel" as recorded. The worst is, that so intrenched has this departure from "the One Hope" become in the churches, that many eminent and pious men assist in maintaining it, and take offence if the facts, as they exist, are plainly stated. Willing to make out that the multitude of pious before and after the First Advent deluded themselves with a false Hope, they are unwilling, owing to *supposed superior knowledge*, to acknowledge themselves to be under *a delusive Hope*. The redeeming feature in some, however, is, that they make their Hope (delusive as it may be in the manner and place of realization) centre in Christ, and thus honoring Christ with us, they are still accounted worthy to experience the hope of the promise made to the Fathers. Alas! so embedded is this *modified Hope* in the affections of many, that if we point to "the One Hope," sustained by Scripture and Tradition, and held by men whose praises are in the churches, it is pronounced "foolishness," or "heresy," or "a return to carnal Jewish notions," etc. To all such, who may honestly, from the amount of knowledge in their possession and the prejudice imbibed against our doctrine, hold such sentiments, we will only say this, that our Hope, the One Hope entertained by the ancient Church, *is confirmed to us by the oath of God Himself* (Heb. 6 : 17–19); and therefore, we cleave to it the more persistently, well knowing how, as predicted such a hope was changed through the application of erroneous principles of interpretation. Let the reader turn back to Prop. 21, and see how all admit that the prophecies grammatically understood sustain this Hope of the pious Jews; then refer to Prop. 35, etc., which shows that but one Kingdom was predicted, and *is it consistent* to reject a hope which is unmistakably presented in the Word of God? How can we substitute one which, as frankly admitted even by many of our opponents, was gradually, as the Church was able to bear it, developed and put in the place of the preceding one? Whatever others may do, we *dare not* accept of *this transmutation* introduced by uninspired men (who gave evidence to much weakness) and which was firmly established in the Church by the rise and progress of the Papacy. Besides this, the sanctifying (Heb. 3 : 6; 1 John 3 : 2, 3; 1 Pet. 1 : 13, etc.) influence of this Hope, when appreciated, as exemplified in Jewish history and in the Christian confessors of the truth, is still connected with it, seeing that instead of a vagueness and indefiniteness thrown around the promises, it brings them forth with clearness and vividness, distinctly perceiving and embracing *the great object of Hope—the Kingdom.*

This is embraced or summed up in the titles of Millenarian works, as e.g. Altinguis's *Spes Israelis;* the Bloomsbury Lent Lectures, Third Ser., 1845; *The Hope of the Apostolic Church; The Restoration, or the Hope of the Early Church Realized,* by Riley; *The Hopes of*

the Church of God, by Darby ; *Spes Fidelium, or the Believer's Hope ; The Hope of Israel*, by Girdlestone ; Janeway's *Hope for the Jews ;* Cox's *Millenarian's Answer of the Hope that is in Him*, etc. For a specimen of the treatment of this Hope, see Prop. 121 and sec. 53.

Obs. 3. "The Blessed Hope" is so precious, so full of comforting Redemptive meaning, that it is distinctly pointed out *in its plain grammatical sense.* It is not predicted "obscurely" or "uncertainly," or "typically," or "figuratively," as many allege. It is not given as multitudes tell us, in such a way that we cannot possibly recognize its meaning, until after the fulfilment, for then it would be unwise for the Master to urge us to desire, pray, look, and watch for its realization. If we cannot understand its meaning, or comprehend its relationship to Redemption, it would be folly to make it so prominent in faith and promise. The Scriptures assume to teach that it is a hope so well grounded and so clearly expressed, that *we can fully appreciate it.*

[1] It is utterly impossible, without a cordial reception of the oath-bound covenants in their literal meaning, without a correct apprehension of the Theocratic ordering under the Messiah as plainly given, without a proper appreciation of the future kingship and priesthood of the saints, and without a knowledge of the Messianic inheritance with which we are joined as co-heirs, *to know the Hope.* Many sermons e.g. are given upon Eph. 1 : 18-20, which eloquently tell us that the third heaven with its blessings is the hope and inheritance ; but in the light of covenant and promise of an inheritance confirmed by the oath of God, all this eloquence, with its beautiful imagery, is misplaced and misleading.

Obs. 4. Some turn from "the Blessed Hope," the appearing of Jesus, and make it a secondary matter, putting death in its place. But the Bible reverses all this, making the Sec. Coming with its glory *the primary thing* and death a subsidiary affair. The latter, at most, has only reference to the preparation of the individual, and leaves an incompleteness of Redemption, while the former pertains to all believers, brings in perfect salvation, and reveals the glory of the Saviour. In comparison with the Second Advent and its glorious consequences, its grand results, death sinks into insignificance. Nothing, so far as the destiny of man or of the world is concerned, can be compared to it. The First Advent brings the saving grace, but the Second perfects it ; the First brought the earnest of Redemption in humiliation, the Second completes it in glory. Hence the intentional scope and profound interest given to it in the New Test., lest (as foreseen) men and believers should give it its modern secondary position.

This is so clearly felt and admitted by our opponents that some who have expressly written against us (as e.g. Dr. Brown), not only concede, but in their way uphold, this primary position. Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 13) remarks : "Pre-Millennialists have done the Church a real service, by calling attention to the place which the Sec. Advent holds in the Word of God, and the scheme of divine truth ;" and he declares, "the Redeemer's Sec. Appearing is *the very Polestar* of the Church," referring to numerous passages affirming its preciousness and practical tendency. Others give the same decisive testimony, as e.g. the *Christian Union* (Aug. 14th, 1878), commenting on the decision of the Congregational Church of Chicago in the case of Dr. Goodwin and Hammond (deciding favorably for the former, who was persecuted by the latter on account of his Pre-Millennial faith), declares, that while it differs from Dr. Goodwin's Second Advent views, yet because of the neglect of the subject and of its position and importance, "it is occasion for thanks that he gives any outlook," and invites renewed investigation by "the thoughtful and scholarly." The Sec. Advent brings in a realization of Hope, and hence we are "to wait for His Son from heaven," to desire, look, pray, and watch for it.

Fausset (*Com.* Tit. 2 : 13) incidentally remarks, "there is but one Greek article to both 'hope' and 'appearing,' which marks their close connection" (the hope being about to be realized only at the appearing of Christ). Our hopes are reflected from this one great Hope, as e.g. 1 Thess. 2 : 19, 20, "What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ *at His Coming?*" It is then that we "enter into the joy of the Lord" (Matt. 25 : 21 ; comp. Alford).

Obs. 5. Such is the preciousness of this Hope, that we are grateful to any who have expressed it, and urged others to accept of its comforting influences. There is (alas !) a tendency among some to disparage, and even unchurch others, because in some things their system of faith is defective, or contradictory, or erroneous ; but making due allowance for human weakness and imperfection (which for the sake of the truth we may specify, without unchristianizing, etc.), the simple fact that this "blessed Hope" is entertained and presented, causes our hearts to warm toward them. It is a bond of union, or, at least, of interested regard, for in it we see them *honoring* "the Christ," and in such honoring we rejoice, hoping that some day, when hope is realized, to see eye to eye in all things. For, if any one "*loves His appearing,*" he certainly loves the Lord Jesus, and we love Him.

Hence we so much admire the expressed Hope of the Reformers and others, many of whom we have quoted in this work. Such adhesion to the Hope is indicative of fellowship with Jesus, and of a "conscience void of offence." When e.g. Stockton, in the *Book Above All,* expresses his faith in the exceeding preciousness of the Sec. Advent, in the fulfilment of the signs, in his waiting for the Lord, in a wish that it may be soon, in the declaration that the only hope of the world is in Jesus, then—whatever differences of view may exist on other points—our heart warms toward the brother as one who is a friend and brother of Jesus. No one can express such heartfelt desires and longings, who is not warmly and truly attached to the Saviour.

Obs. 6. The *exceeding prominency* given to "the blessed hope" in the New Test., should in view of its contents most certainly influence us to give it *a like prominency* in our faith. In reference to the Sec. Advent, Brookes (*Bible Readings*) says : "It is mentioned 318 times in the 260 chapters that make up the New Test., or if the whole book is divided into verses, it occupies one of twenty-five verses from the first of Matthew to the last of Revelation."

If so prominent in the Scriptures, *how* can professed Christians censure us for holding it forth prominently, and urging special attention to it? Seeing that it is such an exceeding precious event, so pregnant with perfected and glorious redemption, *how* can we be censured and abused, if we take a deep interest in the time of its occurrence, imitating the prophets of old, 1 Pet. 1 : 10, 11? If so conspicuously set forth, *how comes it* that so much bitterness and hostility is manifested toward those who present its claims to our consideration? It is thus impressively presented in order that every believer may "*love His appearing,*" and when such love is not entertained, it is strong evidence that the heart and life is not right ; that the professor is unprepared for such an appearing ; that he entertains a false hope. Every consideration urges us (1 Pet. 1 : 13) to "*gird up the loins of our mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" We joyfully confess this Hope and its prominency, and, through the assurance of faith, the glory of a Christ pledged in its behalf, cling to it. "The Parousia of Christ is the Epiphany of God, *in brilliancy like the most precious jewel*" (Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 382). We desire Paul's prayer (Rom. 15 : 13) to be more and more realized in us : "Now the God of Hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that *ye may abound in Hope,* through the power of the Holy Ghost."

Obs. 7. Hope is entertained and expressed in *the absence* of the Redeemer. Having told us that He would speedily come, we believe Him ; and, as we love Him, we hope. Now we are in the period affirmed by Luke 17 : 22, and we hope. The Bridegroom is taken away from us (Luke 5 : 34, 35), but He has told us that He would come soon again, and we have sweet hope.

Hope is the root of a Christian's happiness ; the hope of faith brings peace and joy. It has been well said (Lange's *Com.* 1 Pet., p. 19) : " Christianity is essentially a life of hope—it is founded on living hope. The eye of faith looks out for the glorious revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven, for the first resurrection, for the heavenly city of peace (Jerusalem), for the precious inheritance, for the new heaven and the new earth." Brown (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 18), referring to this absence of the Bridegroom and His promised return, says that it would be " incongruous not to cherish the feeling of desolation in His absence. And never do we please Christ so much as when we ' refuse to be comforted,' even with His own consolations, *save in the prospect of His personal return*" (comp. John 16 : 19–22). " Greybeard " (*Lay Sermons*, No. 107) remarks : " That the Coming of the Lord will bring evil to some people on the earth is very clear ; but the fact that Christians are told to patiently ' *wait for*,' and to ' *love His approaching* ' is proof that the evil will *not be to them*. God does not require His children to anxiously expect and ardently wish for that which will do them harm. The ' trouble ' will fall upon God's enemies. Nor could God exhort His people to hold themselves in constant readiness for the Bridegroom's return if He intended that an interval of a thousand years of peace and blessing on earth were to intervene *before* it came to pass. That would be like admonishing a man intending to take a journey to keep watch all night at a railway station for a train which was expected to arrive some time during the following day."

Obs. 8. In connection with preceding Prop. something may be added concerning the reasons, *why we* should be *glad and rejoice* in view of such a nearness. Long ago Justin said : " You see all sorts of men *big with the hopes* of His Second Coming in glory," which is eminently characteristic of the present time ; for well-known statesmen and humble members of the State, noblemen and the untitled, wealthy and poor, learned and unlearned, prominent divines and laymen, in brief, men of all classes and rank, *look, wait, watch, and pray for the Advent* of the blessed Lord Jesus and the then incoming Kingdom. And this they do *heartily, sincerely*, without the reservation of a definite or Millennial intervening period (for it is difficult to conceive how a person can watch and pray—much less, 2 Pet. 3 : 11, 12, " hasting unto," i.e. earnestly desiring, wishing, longing—for the coming of the day of the Lord with a mind impressed with a theory which negatives such watching and praying), because it is *the most desirable event* that can occur. It is an event *desirable* to Christ (only delayed through motives of mercy and grace), because *then* He obtains His inheritance, and His glory is revealed ; *desirable* to the Father, because *then* His oath-bound covenants are verified and His praise promoted through the Son of His love ; *desirable* to the Spirit, because *then* His faithfulness and power will be specially manifested ; *desirable* to the angels, because *then* the things in which they are so deeply interested will be disclosed in the glory that follows ; *desirable* to saints, because *then* will come to them glorification, kingship and rulership ; *desirable* to the Jewish nation, because *then* shall this King most wonderfully interpose in its behalf ; and *desirable* to the race as such, because *then* shall proceed a series of acts which shall result in lifting the race itself out of its present condition into the enjoyment of Millennial blessedness. There is only one class to whom it is *undesirable*, viz., to the wicked—to those who are so

unbelieving that they continue unrepentant, rejectors of Christ, and wilfully disobedient to the Divine commands. Hence, every one who *truly loves* the Saviour will (2 Tim. 4 : 8) "*love His appearing;*" even those who, either by education or prejudice, etc., may be unprepared to receive the primitive Church doctrine respecting the Kingdom, *still feel* that the Advent, with its *blessed results* (however imperfectly comprehended), is indeed "*the blessed hope.*" Sir Thomas Browne (*Ch. Morals*, sec. 26) remarks : "If the end of the world shall have the same foregoing signs as the period of empires, States, and dominions in it, that is, corruption of manners, inhuman degenerations, and deluge of iniquities, it may be *doubted* whether that final time *be so far off*, of whose day and hour there can be no prescience." After proposing the question why the world has already endured so long, he adds : "However, therefore, the wisdom of the Creator hath ordered the duration of the world, yet since the end thereof brings the accomplishment of *our happiness*, since some would be content that it should have no end, since evil men and spirits do fear that it may be too short, since good men *hope* it may not be *too long*, the prayer of the saints under the altar will be the supplication of the righteous world, *that His mercy should abridge their languishing expectations and hasten the accomplishment of their happy state to come.*" Barnes says (*Com.* 1 Thess. 1 ; Rem. 9) : "It is *our duty and privilege* to 'wait for the Son of God to return from heaven.' We know not when His appearing, either to remove us by death or to judge the world, will be—and we should therefore watch and be ready. *The hope of His return* to our world to raise the dead, and to convey His ransomed to heaven, *is the brightest and most cheerful prospect* that dawns on man, and we should be ready, whenever it occurs, *to hail Him* as our returning Lord, and *to rush to His arms* as our glorious Redeemer. It should be *always the characteristic* of our piety, as it was that of John, to say, '*Even so, come, Lord Jesus.*'" Commenting on 2 Tim. 4 :8, he says : "To believe in the Sec. Advent of the Lord Jesus to judge the world, and *to desire* His return, became a kind of *a criterion* by which Christians were known. No others but *true* Christians were supposed to believe in that, and *no others truly desired it. It is so now.* It is *one* of the characteristics of a *true* Christian that *he sincerely desires the return of his Saviour, and would welcome His appearing* in the clouds of heaven." On 2 Pet. 3 : 13 he remarks (explaining the "hasting unto" to denote "*to await with eager desire*") : "The *true* Christian does not dread the Coming of that day. He looks forward to it as the period of *His redemption*, and would *welcome*, at any time, the return of his Lord and Saviour. While he is willing to wait as long as it shall please God for the Advent of His Redeemer, yet *to Him the brightest prospect* in the future is *that hour* when He shall come to take him to Himself." (Comp. his comments on Phil. 3 : 20 ; 1 Thess. 1 : 10 ; Heb. 9: 28, etc.) We give so much space to the testimony of one who, while advocating a theory which virtually delays the Coming of the Lord at least a thousand years, yet has *such a love* for the Saviour, such a regard for the plain injunctions of Scripture, and such a just apprehension of the *blessedness* resulting from the Advent, that he adopts the language and spirit of the most ardent Millenarian. Such expressions from this class could be multiplied until they filled volumes, for they are the outburst of a heart of love which clearly perceives *how much* depends upon such a coming, and *how largely* it will be productive of the highest

joy and happiness.[1] The desire, longing and prayer of the early Church is well known,[2] influencing, e.g. even Gibbon to ascribe it as one of the causes of the Church's endurance of persecution, etc., and urging a Cyprian to say concerning Jesus : "He whose speedy coming *we daily desire,* whose presence among us we *ardently long for,*" and an Augustine to exclaim of the same that this "*is what we look and pray for!*" True faith and fervent piety cannot help but express itself thus, as e.g. Baxter : "O my Saviour, *hasten* the time of thy return ; send forth thy angels, and let that dreadful, *joyful* trumpet sound ! *Delay not,* lest the living give up their hopes ; *delay not,* lest earth should grow like hell, and thy Church, by division, be all crumbled to dust ; *delay not,* lest thine enemies get advantage of thy flock, and lest pride, hypocrisy, sensuality, and unbelief prevail against thy little remnant, and share among them thy whole inheritance, and when thou comest, thou findest not faith on the earth ; *delay not,* lest the grave should boast of victory, and, having learned rebellion of its guest, should refuse to deliver thee up thy due ! . . . 'Return, O Lord, *how long? Oh, let Thy Kingdom come.*' Thy desolate 'Bride saith, *Come!*' for thy Spirit within her saith, *Come ;* and teacheth her thus to 'pray with groanings which cannot be uttered ; yea, the whole creation saith, *Come,* waiting to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' Thou thyself hast said, '*Surely I come quickly ; Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.*'" (Conclusion of the last ch. of his *Saints' Rest*).[3] But why repeat that which is so clearly taught both in Scripture and in the experience of intelligent piety. Millenarian authors have directed attention to this feature, and justly insist upon it as *a characteristic of enlightened faith and hope ;* because of the excellent things connected with the Advent, such as, that then death will be swallowed up in victory ; that sorrow and sighing and tears shall be banished ; that the enemies of God shall be removed and the Church be triumphant ; that peace and righteousness shall universally prevail ; that Christ's glorious Kingdom will be established never to be removed ; that the saint's rewarding and crowning shall be experienced ; that Paradise will be restored with augmented glory ; that heaven and earth, God and man, nature and the supernatural shall be in open union and fellowship the one with the other ; that the nations of the earth, and even creation, shall rejoice and exult in a manifested Messiah ; and that the saints shall be evermore with the Lord, who bought them with His own blood, in the New Jerusalem state, intimately associated with so gracious and mighty a King, and experiencing the ample fulfilment of covenant and prophetic promise. We know (Prop. 120, 121, etc.) that until this Saviour returns the promises of inheriting the Kingdom, etc., cannot possibly be realized ; that the curse will continue to press heavily upon the individual believer, the Church, and the world ; and that sorrow, trial, tears, etc., are our common lot until He comes. Looking at the present and contrasting it with the blessings of "the Day of the Lord Jesus"—our present weakness and frailty with the being "fashioned like unto His glorious body," our present imperfectly experienced salvation with completed Redemption, our present tempted, suffering condition with appearing with Him in glory, our present heirship while Pilgrims with the actual inheriting of a Kingdom, etc.—who would not *desire, yea, earnestly desire* the Coming of the Lord and His Kingdom, and who would not *cordially respond* to the language of the late Dr. Marsh (*Proph. Times,* vol. 5, p. 159): "Let me speak

to you of the Sec. Advent, which is *the Christian's great hope*, as the First Advent is the foundation of his faith ; for then Christ will assume His office of King ; and not till then will the great enemy of souls, the accuser of the brethren, be bound, error be banished, sin be subdued, and creation cease to groan ; because at His Coming He will establish *the Kingdom* of truth, and righteousness, and peace. What Christian is there, who, believing this, when he hears the Saviour's voice saying, '*Surely I come quickly*,' *will not reply*, '*Amen, even so, come, Lord Jesus.*' "[4]

[1] Olshausen makes a just remark (*Com.*, vol. 1, p. 117). Alluding to the reign of Christ here on earth after His appearance, and the resurrection of the saints and the consequent blessedness, he says of the latter : " Millions desire this most earnestly, hope and pray for it even, without ever imagining that it (viz., Millenarian doctrine) *is the very doctrine* which they think themselves bound to oppose, or at least unable to admit, without deviating from a correct belief."

[2] Compare Prop. 75, etc. A writer (*Proph. Times*, vol. 3, p. 166), referring to the Primitive Church loving the appearing, remarks : " And Massillon may speak for them all, when he affirms of the first Christians, they deem it *one step in apostasy, not to sigh after this return.*" Massillon evidently grounds his opinion upon what Justin said concerning " *the exactly orthodox.*"

[3] Baxter in other places expresses himself decidedly, that "the thoughts of the Coming of the Lord are *most sweet and joyful to me ;*" earnestly prays for the Advent and Kingdom, saying : "Alas ! fellow Christians, what should we do if our Lord should not return ?" This is the day that all believers should long, and hope, and wait for, as being the accomplishment of all the work of their redemption and all the desires and endeavors of their souls." The language of Baxter strongly reminds us of Alleine's : " This is the day (viz., the return of Christ) I look for, and wait for and have laid up *all my hopes* in. If the Lord return not, I profess myself undone ; my preaching is vain, and my suffering is vain ; and the bottom in which I have intrusted all my hopes is forever miscarried," etc. So Bullinger said : "All the godly, with sighs unspeakable, wish for the Coming of the Judge in glory ;" so Luther, Melanchthon, Tyndale, Latimer, Bradford, Bunyan, Piscator, Ridley and a host of others. Seiss, *Last Times*, Dis. 12, gives extracts from Luther, Milton, Cox, Rutherford, and others ; many of a like tenor are to be found in Taylor's *Voice of the Church*, etc. The writer has been forcibly reminded in looking over the writings of all classes in the Church how general is the feeling that the Advent is eminently desirable, and hence—while referring mainly to the expressed sentiments of believers who cannot be charged with a Millenarian bias—the thought has occurred to him that the Millenarian system which *pre-eminently* holds forth this Advent, assigns *the strongest reasons* for its acceptance, and *cultivates faith, hope, and love in it*, ought, at least, from this point of view to meet with *respectful attention* and *due examination* from all believers. If the Advent is so desirable, as a host of witnesses, including all shades of opinion, testify to, then anything that serves to explain or throw light upon it ought to be candidly considered.

[4] While penning the last sentences, the thought presented itself to the writer that in the Coming Kingdom we shall meet many who thus watched, desired, and prayed for the blessed Advent whose names are either incidentally mentioned in print or utterly unknown ; as e.g. of the one class, Alfieri (Michelet's *Life of Luther*, Ap., p. 405) who, in an address to Luther (1542 in name of the churches of Venice, Vicenza and Trieso), expresses his hope : " Wandering and dispersed, *we wait with impatience the Coming of the Lord's Mighty One*," etc. (reminding us of Rutherford's saying : " Though the time be very short, *yet love and longing make it tedious*") ; and of the other class, the case of some pious slaves (recorded in *the Life of* the Methodist preacher Cartwright) who, at the occurrence of an earthquake and at the falling of the meteors years ago, instead of being alarmed, exulted and rejoiced in it as a sign of a Coming Saviour, while the masters were greatly frightened. During the persecutions of past centuries how many sighed for the Advent. What happiness to meet such and hear from their own glorified lips the story of faith and hope. Love cannot transform " the blessed hope" into one of terror ; it is sin or unbelief that thus transmutes it. It is delightful to think of the time when in glorified social converse we shall hear from the quickened lips of an Irenæus, or Justin, or Luther, or Calvin, or Zwingli, and many others, how they, amid trial and darkness, loved " the appearing" of Jesus—how this hope sustained them, etc.

Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 365-66) says: "It was *a leading characteristic* of the early Christians that they loved His appearing; and if any who now profess to be Christians do not love it, they ought to be made to understand that there is no promise of a crown of righteousness (2 Tim. 4 : 8) for them at that day. What would you think of an exile if he were to exhibit the deepest distress and grief at the summons to return home after years of lonely wandering in distant lands? What would you think of a citizen, if he were to turn pale on hearing that the court will soon convene, and the judge will ascend the tribunal? What would you think of a wife, if she shuddered and trembled at the announcement that she might expect her absent husband any hour? There is a conscious guilt there that makes them cowards; and when those who claim to be Christians cry out that they cannot bear the doctrine of our Lord's Sec. Advent, they give melancholy evidence of not knowing that there is an unsettled controversy between them and God. They cannot think without terror of Christ's Coming, because they are not prepared for it," etc. The least that can be said is that they exhibit *gross ignorance* of the object of Christ's Advent in relation to believers. Jesus Himself (Matt. 9 : 15) has expressed the sorrow that His absence should cause in the hearts of those yearning for His presence, but alas! multitudes reverse this, and consider that His absence is a cause for joy; His presence is not desirable even when professing ardent and supreme love for Him! Seiss (*Last Times*, p. 308) says: "No, no, no; the doctrine of the Saviour's speedy Coming is *not* a thing of gloom and sadness. It is *Gospel—pure Gospel*—nothing but *good news*. If it has anything distressing in it, you yourself must put it there by your hard-heartedness, your prayerlessness, and unforsaken sin. If you have fixed your heart and faith on Jesus as your Prophet, Priest and King, you have naught to fear and everything to hope." "Is He your Alpha and your Omega—your all in all? Then fear not. Only be faithful a little longer, and the day will come which will be to you a gladder day than ever you thought it possible for you to see. And as you behold the fig leaves putting forth as the heralds of its approach, '*look up and lift up your head; for your redemption draweth nigh.*'" Dr. Hodge (*Com.* 1 Cor. 1 : 7) says that the Sec. Advent, owing to its connected blessings, "was the object of longing expectation to all the early Christians;" and, "so general was this expectation that Christians were characterized as those '*who love His appearing*,' 2 Tim. 4 : 8, and as those '*who wait for Him*,' Heb. 9 : 28." After showing that "the Spirit awakens desire for that event," he adds: "If the Second Coming of Christ is to Christians of the present day less an object of desire than it was to their brethren during the apostolic age, it must be because they think the Lord is 'slack concerning His promise,' and forget that with Him a thousand years is as one day." Thus compare Trench's remarks, *On the Parables*, as e.g. in the Parable of the Ten Virgins. Hackett (*Com.* Acts 3 : 20) indorses the early Church belief, that the Sec. Advent "*was always near* to the feelings and consciousness of the first believers. It was the great consummation on which *the strongest desires* of their souls were fixed, to which their thoughts and hopes habitually turned. They lived in expectation of it; they labored to be prepared for it; they were constantly, in the expressive language of Peter, *looking for and hastening unto it*," etc. He speaks of it as "filling their circle of view," being "the grand object" of hope, so that they were, "in such a state of sympathy with an event so habitually present to their thoughts, they derived, they must have derived, their *chief incentives* to action." But alas! let a believer to-day occupy this position of the early Christians, making the Sec. Advent the object of desire, longing, prayer, conversation, preaching, etc.—let him assume the spirit and motive which even our opponents in their commentaries, etc., profess to admire, admit to be eminently scriptural and practical, and inform us is positively enjoined by the Saviour as characteristic of a true believer, and what is the sad result? Why this: that his brethren in the Church regard him as "fanatical," given to "an unwholesome enthusiasm," evidencing "a disordered mind," presenting "an unhealthy eccentricity," etc. In many works, reviews, newspapers, etc., these charges are reiterated, and brethren who "love the appearing" are held up to ridicule and scorn. In this connection we will quote Dr. Gordon's (*Christian Intelligencer*, 1865) remarks on "the Difficulties of Post-Millenarianism," where he says: "Their objections thought to be most damaging to our views, in many instances recoil upon their own, and give prominence to the difficulties they encounter in their defence. For instance, one writer, too eager to overthrow the Millenarian doctrine respecting the speedy Coming of Christ, says: 'From the first period of the Church's history, this dogma has been associated with the most deplorable fanaticism.' Others add, 'It results in Infidelity.' It is remarkable that the putters-forth of this objection do not see into what a position they are placed by it. They profess to believe that Jesus Christ will literally come at some time, as well as we, and when He comes it will be speedily to the men of that

generation then living. The doctrine will then be productive of fanaticism, and perhaps infidelity, because according to their showing, these evils are inseparable from a belief in Christ's speedy Advent. The objection, then, lies not only against His speedy Coming, but against His Coming at all ; for if such be the necessary consequences of the doctrine, certainly it ought never to be preached, and ought never to have been revealed. The objection, therefore, impeaches *the wisdom of Christ* in making known to man the fact of His Coming again in the clouds, and thence drawing an argument *for our constant watching*. If 'from the very first period of the Church's history, this doctrine was associated with the most deplorable fanaticism,' and if, according to Post-Millenarian writers—who tell us that the first three centuries constituted the *purest* age of the Church—Chiliasm for all that time was the orthodox faith, then beyond question the purest age of the Church was the age of the most deplorable fanaticism? And for this great defection, who were responsible but the fanatical Apostles? Paul said *the grace of God taught all men to look for the glorious appearing of Christ.* He therefore converted men not only to Christianity but to fanaticism, according to our brethren, for he says expressly that *they turned to God from idols to wait for His Son from heaven!* Was not this an unfounded expectation, and has not the lapse of time proved this *waiting* to have been just as fanatical as in any of us, who are thus ridiculed for 'that blessed hope.' And was not John just as far astray as Paul, when to the assurance of the Redeemer, '*Surely I come quickly*,' he appended the prayer, '*Even so, come, Lord Jesus.*' Nearly eighteen centuries have passed away and He has not come yet! Who does not see that 'it results in infidelity?' We do not wish to utter an unbecoming word, but we think that many of the objections of our brethren, deemed most formidable, only serve to force their own system between the millstones of *Reductio ad absurdum.*'' "Greybeard" (*Lay Sermons*, No. 105) justly observes : "The proper attitude of all true believers, as the constituents of the Bride, during our Lord's absence, is that of waiting patiently for His Second Coming, 2 Thess. 3 : 5.'' Consequently of every one it should be said (Conybeare and Howson's rendering of 1 Thess. 1 : 10): "*Now you wait with eager longing for the return of His Son from the heavens, even Jesus, whom He raised from the dead, our deliverer from the coming vengeance.*'' Dr. Willis Lord concludes his little volume, *The Blessed Hope*, as follows : "This then is that blessed hope ; the glorious Coming of the Lord. It is the next great epoch of the future. The Old Test. saints looked forward to the First Coming of Christ. It was *their Polar Star.* After weary ages, faith was turned to sight. Men saw the Son of God incarnate. Simeon took Him in his arms. Mary sat adoring at His feet. Peter pressed close to His side. John rested on His bosom. Paul, too, saw Him on His way to Damascus, and the sight was his salvation. Jews and Gentiles saw Him, and put Him to death on the cross. The New Test. saints look forward to the Second Coming of Christ. This is *their Polar Star.* Again the ages have been long and weary, but the end cometh. The world may scoff ; and the Church even may let go this holy faith ; but, at the appointed time, the Church and the world will see the Lord Coming in power and for righteous judgment. They will see the dead in Christ living, and sitting with Him on His throne, and then the Millennial glory. This vast truth pervades and inflames the Scriptures. They declare it as a divine certainty. They make it the ground of argument. They hold it up as a most powerful motive. They use it to strengthen faith, encourage hope, promote humility, fortify patience, mitigate sorrow, incite watchfulness, impel obedience, inspire prayer, increase holiness, and awaken joy. What a great blank there would be without it in even the Word of God! What a serious subtraction there would be from those sacred resources, by which His people are made strong for the work and battle of life, and to win the Conqueror's crown. What wonder that Paul calls it, moved by his own sense of its grandeur and by the special light and power of the Holy Ghost : '*That blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*'"

PROPOSITION 183. *The doctrine of the Kingdom and its related subjects have a direct practical tendency.*

Its practical nature and tendency is already sufficiently manifest from the preceding propositions, the history of the doctrine, the life of those who held it, the prominence given to it in the Scriptures, and its fundamental relationship to an enlightened faith and hope. But in justice to ourselves, and by way of self-defence against unfounded objections, it deserves special mention.

Nearly every Millenarian work has something to say on the practical nature of the doctrine, and has a chapter or more devoted to the subject. We direct attention to a few recent publications, as e.g. the following papers given at the Prophetic Conference at New York : Dr. Brookes, *The Coming of the Lord in its Relation to Christian Doctrine ;* Dr. Clark, *Hope of Christ's Coming as a Motive to Holy Living and Active Labor ;* Dr. Craven, *The Coming of the Lord in its Relation to Christian Doctrine.* Brookes's *Maranatha*, ch. 7, Seiss's *Last Times*, Ap., pp. 364-83, and numerous Pre-Mill. writers advert to the subject. The last Prop. contains the statements of several eminent men, and under various Props. (as e.g. Martensen's, Prop. 174, Obs. 1, note, etc.) similar expressions are given. Dr. Riggenbach (Lange's *Com.* 1 *Thess.*, p. 79) refers to the hope of the nearness of the Sec. Advent and its practical tendency, and takes the ground that it is a chief characteristic of the true Christian ; after reference to the example of the early Church, he says : " But only too frequently does this way of thinking assume such a form, that the longing for the Coming of the Lord and the glory of His holy Kingdom, as well as sympathy in the fortunes of the Church at large, is too much impaired. At times, on the other hand, and among the pious, when the life of faith *rules in due force*, we *again* meet likewise with the apostolic hope and aspiration in living freshness. That watching and hoping are so unfamiliar to us, *is a defect.* The *more* we become heavenly in our character and thoughts, the *more* also does the stream of human history appear to us a hasting toward the Coming of the Lord."

Obs. 1. Constantly is the question asked, " Of what practical use is the doctrine of Christ's Sec. Coming and of His Millennial Kingdom ?" And often it is added, by way of response, " If we are saved, that is sufficient." Ignorance of the nature and results of " the Blessed Hope" alone can produce such an interrogatory and position ; an ignorance, too, *utterly unjustifiable* in any believer of the Scriptures.

This question of its being practical, before willing to accept of it, is not one for the believer to ask. *Is it God's Word ? Does He ask me to believe and act ?* These are the questions to be answered. It would be an act of gross unbelief to reject it even if not practical (in the sense the objector uses it) in its nature. Did Abraham pause to ask and decide such a question when called on to offer up Isaac ? Did any of the ancient worthies refuse any truth revealed, unless it could be shown that it was practical ? Even if nothing else could be asserted respecting it than that it is a revealed truth without any special bearing, we ought to receive, and, if demanded, proclaim it. Like Abraham, Rom. 4 : 18-21, we give glory to God and secure His divine approval, by our faith in His word. We live *a life of faith*, and faith *honors* God and His Christ. But to leave us utterly without excuse, this doctrine is eminently practical ; and it requires perverseness and a willing blindness to avoid seeing it. Some, particularly, urge the objection (to show its unpractical tendency) that we preach the doctrine, and it makes the minister

necessarily polemical, which is not a following Christ. When the objectors preach the opposite, write against us, etc., it is not polemical but a following after Christ! We leave the good sense of the reader to dispose of the excuse.

Obs. 2. Its decisive and far-reaching influence is seen in the fact that it materially affects the interpretations of the Bible (see e.g. Prop. 4). The covenants, prophecies of the Old and New Tests., parables, thousands of passages, and even entire chapters are understood very differently from the meaning attributed to them by others. The Kingdom, the Gospel of the Kingdom, the reign of the Christ, and a vast number of related subjects have an import very diverse to the sense usually attributed to them. Of course, any doctrine which has such an influence in determining the meaning of Scripture, its application, etc., must be of great importance.

This e.g. is clearly recognized by our opponent, Dr. Brown, when (*Christ's Sec. Coming*, p. 6) he says of Pre-Millenarianism : "It is a school of Scripture interpretation ; it infringes upon and affects some of the most commanding points of the Christian faith ; and, when suffered to work its unimpeded way, it stops not till it has pervaded with its own genius *the entire system* of one's theology, and *the whole tone* of his spiritual character, constructing, I had almost said, a world of its own ; so that holding the same faith and cherishing the same fundamental hopes as other Christians, he yet sees things through a medium of his own, and finds everything instinct with *the life* which this doctrine has generated within him." He also (p. 12) declares : "When they dilate upon the prominence given to this doctrine in Scripture, and the practical uses which are made of it, they touch a chord in the heart of every simple lover of his Lord, and *carry conviction* to all who tremble at His Word ; so much so, that I am persuaded that nine tenths of all who have embraced the Pre-Millennial view of the Sec. Advent have done so on the supposition that no other view of it will admit of an unfettered and unmodified use of the Scripture language on the subject—that it has its proper interpretations and full force only on this theory."

Obs. 3. Our doctrine deals largely in *Eschatology*, of which Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com.*, *Luke*, p. 326) says : "It lies in the nature of the case that Christian eschatology, the more the course of time advances, must become less and less an unimportant appendix, and more and more a *locus primarius* of Christian doctrine." The personal relationship that we sustain to the future, the nature of the things discussed, the interest of the world, the honor and glory of the Redeemer—all indicates that our doctrine must necessarily assume a prominence and corresponding influence.

The subjects thus connected are of vast importance and of the highest interest, such e.g. as the nature, manner and time of the Messianic Kingdom to be set up ; the nature, manner and time of the Sec. Advent ; the nature, manner and time of the completion of redemption ; the precise destiny of the believer, the Church and the world ; the destiny of the enemies of God ; the destiny of the Jewish people ; the course and order of events pertaining to the last times ; the signs preceding the Advent and pertaining to the interval ; the stages of the Advent ; the resurrection and translation ; the rise, progress and end of the culminated Antichrist ; the Millennial reign, blessedness and glory. Our doctrine gives Eschatology *a grandeur* which even some of our opponents admit, as e.g. in the destiny of the race as a race under the reign of the mighty Theocratic King and His incorporated rulers. When looking at the extent and sublimity which we give to it, no wonder that some of them pronounce it at least, "a magnificent theory." In relation to its central doctrine, Dr. Frönmüller (Lange's *Com.* 1 *Pet.* p. 18) says : "Our Lord's return has been one of the fundamental articles of the faith of universal Christendom in every age of the Church's history. To hide this important doctrine under a bushel, is at once *a defect of teaching and in opposition to the mind of Christ and His Apostles.*"

Obs. 4. Indeed, some things connected with our doctrine are regarded *so essential* to the completeness of Christian character, that the true believer

is represented as in possession of them. Thus, e.g. 1 Cor. 1 : 7 "*So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Here we have undoubtedly presented a leading, distinguishing characteristic of a believer. A symmetrical character demands the heart and attitude of a waiting, watching servant. Dr. Klink (Lange's *Com. loci*) observes: "'This constant expectation of our Lord's Second Coming (Rom. 8 : 19, etc.), when He shall be revealed in His glory unto all (Col. 3 : 4), is one of the characteristic features of primitive Christianity." (Comp. Phil. 3 : 20; 1 Thess. 1 : 10; Tit. 2 : 13; 2 Tim. 4 : 8.) No matter how we may interpret the connection, it is a fact, plainly evidenced by the passage, that the believers specially trained under the apostleship *had this characteristic*, and are *commended* for its possession.

Alford (*Com. loci*) justly makes this posture of "waiting" to be "the greatest proof of maturity and richness of the spiritual life; implying the co-existence and co-operation of *faith*, whereby they believed the promise of Christ—*hope*, whereby they looked on to its fulfilment—and *love*, whereby that anticipation was lit up with earnest desire." It evidences the highest obedience to the command of their Saviour, and that the mind was full of the promises relating to His Coming. It shows that influenced and urged on by this prospect of the Advent and their waiting for it, Christians are excited to attain a high spiritual growth or as Kling puts it in the Homilet. and Practical part: "The right waiting for the Coming of Christ allows us to remain neither idle nor unfruitful, but inspires us with an earnest zeal constantly *to appropriate and improve every spiritual gift.*" Comp. the decisive utterances of Barnes given in Obs. 8 of the preceding Proposition. We append another on the passage before us. He says on 1 Cor. 1 : 7, the waiting: "This was, certainly, *one* of the endowments to which he referred, to wit, that they had grace given them earnestly to desire and to wait for the second appearing of the Lord Jesus. An earnest wish to see Him, and a confident expectation and firm belief that He will return, is *an evidence of a high state of piety.* It demands strong faith, and *it will do much* to elevate the feelings above the world, and to keep the mind in a state of peace." Bengel, on the same, quaintly refers to the prevailing substitution thus: "Leaving to others their 'memento mori' (remember death) do thou earnestly cherish this joyous expectation of the Lord's Coming." Dr. M'Caul (*The Blessed Hope,*) well remarks: "The practice of waiting for the Sec. Advent is *an essential feature* in the character of a true Christian." Calvin (quoted, Lange's *Com.* 1 Pet. 4 : 7) took the same view when he said: "It ought to be *the chief concern* of believers to fix their minds fully on His Sec. Advent." Luther, in his "Sermon of Consolation" (p. 23; quoted *Proph. Times*, vol. 12, p. 151) pointedly remarks: "If thou be not filled with a desire after the Coming of this day, thou canst never pray the Lord's prayer, nor canst thou repeat from thy heart the creed of faith. For with what conscience canst thou say, 'I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting,' if thou dost not *in thy heart desire* the same? If thou didst believe it, thou must, of necessity, desire it from thy heart, and long for that day to come; which, if thou dost not desire, thou art *not yet a Christian*, nor canst thou boast of thy faith." (It has been well remarked: "The application of such a rule as this to the churches of Christendom would unchristianize many in our day.") John Knox (*John Knox and the Churches of England*, by Dr. Lorimer,) took this as a leading characteristic of a Christian, that he addressed (1554) a letter "To the Faithful in London, New Castle, and Berwick, and to all others in the realm of England, that love the Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (in which letter he expresses his hope of the Lord's speedy return). Compare Hackett on *Acts*, p. 63-64, who impressively shows how "*the strongest desires* of the soul" were fixed "habitually" upon and "*the chief incentives* to action" derived from it. Olshausen on 1 Thess. 1 : 10, affirms that "to wait for the Son of God is *the most appropriate mark* of a true Christian," and Auberlen (Lange's *Com. loci*) says: "The Apostle defines the life aim of the converts into two particulars, the service of God and the waiting for the return of His Son from heaven," and (Hom. and Prac.), "The *Christian* is a man who serves God and waits for Jesus." Calvin (same) is made to say: "In the service of God, which in the corruption of our nature is a more than difficult matter, we are kept and established by the expectation of Christ; otherwise the world drags us back to itself, and we grow weary. Waiting for the Lord is *a main point* (1) in the doctrine of Jesus and His Apostles; (2) in the life of faith of the Apostles and first Christians." Out of a multitude of similar testimonies, we quote another from Theophilus Gale (taken

from his "Discourse on Christ's Coming," London, 1673, and given in *Lond. Quart. Journal of Proph.*, vol. 7, p. 289): "We see the true reason why so many professors, and some truly godly, are so far behind in their Christian race, and have so much of their work before them. . . . Whence comes all this but from want of *serious, lively expectations* of their Lord's approach? Believe it, there is a deep mysterie, a spiritual art and skill in Godlinesse which none arrive unto so soon *as they* who wait for the Coming of their Lord. What made the Thessalonians, in a short time, to arrive unto such high pitches of Christianitie, but they imbibed or sucked in, at their first conversion, *this principle of waiting for the Coming of the Lord* (1 Thess. 1 : 10)? and O! that professors would trie this experiment! Verily, we should not have such complaints, decays, follies, and scandals, among professors, as we now everywhere find. It is *a sure and fixed rule*, that no one hath made a further proficience in the schole of Christ, than he can with hope and joy expect the Coming of Christ." Hence Van Oosterzee (Lange's *Com.* 2 *Tim.*, p. 114) declares: "The affectionate longing for the appearing of the Lord in glory, presupposes a high degree of spiritual life; and, on the other side, is admirably fitted to nourish, to perfect, to purify that life."

Obs. 5. It is only requisite to point out how the New Test. uses the doctrine of the Second Advent, in order to show how essential it is to Christian doctrine, duty, and character. This we will do in the briefest manner. It is given 1, to interest us in a blessed coming, Matt. 23 : 39; Luke 13 : 35 and 21 : 27; 2 Thess. 1 : 10; Heb. 9 : 28; 1 Pet. 1 : 7, 13; Rev. 22 : 7, 20; 2, to encourage faithfulness by a reward, Matt. 16 : 27 and 24 : 47; 2 Thess. 1 : 7–11; 2 Tim. 4 : 8; Rev. 22 : 12; 3, to bring out the hope of reward in a "regeneration," Matt. 19 : 28, 29; Acts 3 : 19–21; 4, to avoid deception, Matt. 24 : 23–27; Luke 17 : 23, 24; 2 Tim. 4 : 1–5; 5, to hold forth the culmination of the age, Matt. 24 : 30, etc.; 6, to show the condition of the world, Matt. 24 : 37–39; Luke 17 : 26–30; 1 Thess. 5 : 1–4; 7, to teach a translation, Matt. 24 : 39–41; Luke 17 : 34–36; 1 Thess. 4 : 17; 8, to urge to watchfulness, Matt. 24 : 42 and 25 : 13; Mark 13 : 33, 37; Luke 12 : 35–37 and 21 : 34–36; 1 Thess. 5 : 4–6; Rev. 16 : 15; 9, to influence to constant readiness, Matt. 24 : 44 and 25 : 1–13 and 22 : 11; Luke 12 : 35–40; 10, to incite ministerial fidelity, Matt. 24 : 45–47; Luke 12 : 42–44; 1 Thess. 2 : 19, 20; 2 Tim. 4 : 1–5; 1 Pet. 5 : 1–4; 11, to rebuke ministerial unfaithfulness, Matt. 24 : 48–51; Luke 12 : 45–48; 12, to teach the condition of the Church, Matt. 25 : 1–12; Luke 18 : 8; 2 Thess. 2 : 1–12; 13, to hold forth coming judgment, Matt. 25 : 19, 27, 31–46; 2 Thess. 1 : 8, 9; Jude 14–16; Rev. 1 : 7 and 19 : 11–16; 14, to show us His majesty and glory, Matt. 26 : 64 and 25 : 31 and 24 : 30; Mark 13 : 26 and 14 : 61; 15, to a confession of Christ, Mark 8 : 38; Luke 9 : 26; 16, to incite prayer, Mark 13 : 33; Luke 21 : 36; 1 Pet. 4 : 7; Rev. 22 : 20; 17, to waiting, 2 Thess. 3 : 5; 1 Cor. 1 : 7; 1 Thess. 1 : 10; Luke 12 : 36; 18, to expectation and looking, Tit. 2 : 13; Phil. 3 : 20; Heb. 9 : 28; 2 Pet. 3 : 12, 14; Rev. 1 : 7; 19, to love and desire, 2 Tim. 4 : 8; Rom. 8 : 23; 2 Cor. 5 : 2; Rev. 22 : 20; Tit. 2 : 13; 20, to promised honor, Luke 12 : 37, 39; Matt. 24 : 46, 47; 1 Pet. 1 : 7; 2 Thess. 1 : 10; 1 Pet. 5 : 4; 21, to occupation during postponement of Kingdom, Luke 19 : 11–27; Matt. 25 : 14–30; 22, to encourage joy and peace in approaching redemption, Luke 21 : 28; John 16 : 16–33; 1 Thess. 1 : 10; 23, to impart comfort, John 14 : 1–3, 28; 2 Thess. 1 : 7; 2 Tim. 2 : 12; 24, to bestow assurance, Acts 1 : 11 and 3 : 19–21; Rom. 11 : 26; Luke 21 : 34, 36; 25, to test character, 1 Thess 1 : 9, 10 and 5 : 4–9; 1 Cor. 1 : 7, 8; 26, to avoid misjudging, 1 Cor. 4 : 5; 27, to remembrance and celebration of His Coming, 1 Cor. 11 : 26; 28, to inspire hope in the resurrection, 1 Cor.

15 : 23 ; Phil. 3 : 20, 21 ; 1 Thess. 4 : 13–18 ; 29, to inculcate moderation, Phil. 4 : 5 ; 30, to excite heavenly mindedness, Col. 3 : 1–4 ; 31, to arouse brotherly love, 1 Thess. 3 : 12, 13 ; 32, to future rejoicing in successful labor, 1 Thess. 2 : 19, 20 ; 33, to sanctification, 1 Thess. 5 : 23 ; 1 John 3 : 2, 3 ; 34, to comfort in bereavement, 1 Thess. 4 : 18 ; 35, to urge steadfastness, 2 Thess. 2 : 1, 2 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 14 ; 1 Pet. 5 : 4 ; 36, to consideration of Antichrist and his doom, 2 Thess. 2 : 8 ; 37, to infuse diligence and activity, 2 Tim. 4 : 1–8 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 14 ; 38, to mortification of the flesh, Col. 3 : 4, 5 ; Tit. 2 : 12, 13 ; Luke 21 : 34 ; 2 Pet. 3 : 12 ; 39, to soberness, 1 Pet. 1 : 13 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 6 ; Phil. 4 : 5 ; 40, to regard it as the great hope, Tit. 2 : 13 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 13 ; Col. 3 : 4 ; 41, to induce perseverance, Rev. 2 : 25 and 3 : 3, 11 ; 42, to an abiding with Christ, 1 John 2 : 28 and 3 : 2 ; 43, to patience under trial, James 5 : 7, 8 ; 2 Thess. 3 : 5 and 1 : 4–10 ; 1 Pet. 4 : 12, 13 ; 44, to patience, Heb. 10 : 36, 37 ; James 5 : 7 ; 45, to a proclamation, Tit. 2 : 11–15 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 4–10 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 1–8 ; 46, to suitable preparation, Rev. 16 : 15 ; 47, to urge men to turn to God, Acts 3 : 19–21 ; Rev. 3 : 3 ; 48, to enforce obedience, 1 Tim. 4 : 13, 14 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 1 ; 49, to bring salvation, Heb. 9 : 28 ; 50, to coming gladness and exceeding joy, 1 Pet. 4 : 13.

This can be greatly enlarged, as e.g. pertaining 1, to induce sincerity, Phil. 1 : 9–10 ; 2, to holy conversation and godliness, 2 Pet. 3 : 11–13 ; 3, to brotherly love, 1 Thess. 3 : 12, 13 ; 4, to confidence, Phil. 1 : 6 ; 5, to a hope of a crown, Rev. 3 : 11 ; 6, to manifestation of saints, 2 Cor. 5 : 16 ; Col. 3 : 4 ; 7, to retribution, 2 Thess. 2 : 7, 8 ; 8, to promised dominion and authority, Matt. 16 : 27 ; 1 Cor. 4 : 5, etc. ; 9, to future kingship and priesthood, Rev. 1 : 6 ; 10, to reigning on the earth, Rev. 5 : 10, and 20 : 4 ; 11, to Jewish restoration, conversion, and supremacy, Rom. 11 : 15, etc. ; 12, to the binding of Satan, Rev. 20 : 1-6 ; 13, to the deliverance of creation, Rom. 8 : 19-23 ; 14, to the new heavens and new earth, 2 Pet. 3 : 13 ; Rev. 21 : 1 ; 15, to the New Jerusalem, Rev. 21 : 10, etc. Any reader of the present work will see the multiplicity of subjects with which our doctrine stands related and interwoven. Hence the extreme significance of the adjuration of the Apostle, 2 Tim. 4 : 1–8 (comp. Lange, Conybeare and Howson, Alford, etc.)

Obs. 6. The light that it throws on single doctrines is something worthy of consideration, such as e.g. the resurrection, making a distinctive first and second resurrection ; the judgment of believers, distinguishing between a judgment unto eternal life and a judgment according to works ; the conversion of the world, the time, order, and manner ; the future glorious baptism of the Holy Ghost, when and its extent ; the Father's house, what it is, and when established ; the Gentile domination and its ending ; the persecution of the Church and its results ; the priesthood of Jesus and its perpetuity ; the durability of the Messianic Kingdom ; the nature, advantages, etc., of a Theocratic Kingdom ; the restitution and its realization ; the "Rest" and its definite meaning ; the design of the dispensation and its practical accomplishment ; the Day of Judgment and its manifestations, etc. Indeed, there is scarcely a subject in the Bible with which it is not linked, and upon which, either directly or indirectly, it does not impart information.

Thus it defines and vindicates the Judgeship of Jesus, the inheriting of the earth, the perpetuation of the race, the intermediate state, the "world to come," the perpetuity of the earth, the ending of the age, a future revelation of the divine will, the unity of Scripture, the work of Christ for redemptive purposes, the entailment of the curse and its ultimate removal, the credibility and inspiration of the Scriptures, the Church and the Kingdom of God with the relation that the one sustains to the other, the divine Sover

eignty and the Kingship of Jesus, the exaltation of the Christ, etc. It serves largely to explain Scripture, by furnishing the means which indicate the relationship of one part to the other. It enables us to discriminate what pertains to this, or to the future, dispensation. It enlightens us in reference to Providence and the history of the world, by showing the Theocratic Purpose and Plan, and the methods instituted in order to secure their final and complete accomplishment. It brings forth a perfect vindication of the preaching of the disciples, Apostles, and Primitive Church. It holds forth prominently and logically the postponement of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent, assigning the reasons for the same. It enforces the mutual connection existing between the Old and New Tests. It develops, as no other can, the doctrine of election, the process of engrafting, and the continuation of the election. It gives to portions of the Word, as e.g. the transfiguration, temptation, etc., new force and beauty. It brings out with vividness and power the covenanted inheritance of the Son of David, and that of His co-heirs. It enables one to readily detect and avoid the erroneous interpretations placed on the covenants and the promises of God. It upholds and confirms the necessity of the Supernatural, the supremacy of Scripture, the study of prophecy, the faith of the pious Jews, and the watching posture of martyrs and confessors. It gives to us, what no other system presents so grandly, *a perfect Redeemer and a perfect Redemption.* Surely a doctrine which permeates and gives new life and vigor to so many other related doctrines ; which lays its beautifying hand on so many subjects pertaining to our highest personal interests, must, in the nature of the case, be pre-eminently practical.

Obs. 7. Notwithstanding the evidence (Scriptural) to its practical nature and tendency, and the admissions of opposers to the same, some men, not merely ask the question under Obs. 1, but flatly deny that it possesses *any practical value.* Such declarations evidently spring from prejudice and bitter animosity ; they cannot possibly be the conclusions of a calm and impartial survey of the subject. The wholesale denunciation, the unlimited denial *defeats itself* by its contradiction to the express affirmations of Scripture and the testimony of believers.

Thus e.g. Rev. McCook (as reported in the *Messiah's Herald,* Jan. 15th, 1879) says : " There is no doubt that the general teaching of such a doctrine would be disastrous in effects. Its tendency would be to destroy reliance upon all ordinary means of grace, such as preaching," etc. Many declare that it converts us into " heretics," " fanatics," " dangerous errorists," etc. Comment is unnecessary. It is especially supposed that the looking for the speedy Coming of the Lord is " a great practical evil," subversive of the interests of society, the Church, and the individual. We are not concerned in defending the childish attitude of some Millerites and a few Sec. Adventists who equipped themselves in ascension robes, etc., for this only indicates a lack of intelligence in grasping the subject, to which—as past history testifies—all doctrine has been more or less exposed, and consequently perverted or rendered ridiculous. It certainly had not this influence upon the early Church, the Reformers, and ten thousand others, noted for piety, ability, and usefulness ; for all such, keeping in view the command of Christ to " occupy until I come," and the fact that the precise day and hour is unknown, attended with diligence and hope to all the proper callings and duties of life, so that if Jesus should come He might find them engaged at their respective posts. (In Props. 155, 156, 130, etc., we quote what opponents declare, over against the facts stated under this one.)

Obs. 8. It may be well to notice a few testimonials respecting its personal application and practical tendency, aside from those already given. George Müller (Sermon at Mildmay Park. June 29th, 1879), after referring to the apostles and early Christians as looking for the return of Jesus, and to the command to watch, adds ; " Now, my beloved Christian friends, how is it with us? Let us honestly ask ourselves, Are we looking for the return of the Lord Jesus Christ? Are we waiting for the return of the Lord Jesus Christ? Next month, it will be fifty-three years with me that I have been waiting for the Lord Jesus Christ, and, by God's grace, I am

not less looking for Him now. I stay, waiting for His return now as I did at the first. Now, I ask my beloved Christian friends here, are you looking for His return? Do you *with joyful anticipation* go forward to the return of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is it *a pleasant thought* to you that Jesus Christ is coming to you? That He is coming again, that He will return, that He will not always be absent? If the bridegroom leaves the bride, she looks for his return. *The sooner the better*, the bride says. So if the Church is in a right state, if there is attachment to the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, she *longs* for His return; she *looks* for His return. How is it with us regarding this?" Lisco (*On the Parables*, p. 183) remarks: "The believers of the old covenant looked for the Coming of Messiah, Isa. 60 : 1 ss. and 64 : 1; Luke 2 : 25. The believers who live under the new covenant look for His Second Coming, Phil. 3 : 21; Heb. 9 : 28; Tit. 2 : 11, ss. This expectation is *a powerful means*, in the hand of God, for raising and sanctifying the heart; it springs out of faith in the promises of the Lord, Matt. 25 : 31; John 14 : 3 and 17 : 24; Acts 1 : 9–11, and is at once *the proof and the nourishment of love* to Him; we look for Him because we love Him, and could not love Him if we were not looking for Him; we look for Him because we have already experienced love to Him when absent, 1 Pet. 1 : 8; and this expectancy toward Christ's Coming and preparation for it, is *the leading purpose and main concern of all true Christians*, Col. 3 : 1, ss."

Dr. Dorner (*Person of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 409–15) has again and again insisted on the practical tendency of Chiliasm. We reproduce, as an illustration, several remarks: "It is *unjustifiable* to say that Chiliasm degrades faith and sanctity in this life, to the rank of mere means whose end lies outside of themselves. They continue to be ends themselves, though at the same time regarded as preparing the way for a new and more perfect stadium. The present world is a period of suffering, especially for the members of the one thousand years' Kingdom." "Chiliasm, therefore, was the form in which Christianity first gave conscious expression to the conviction of its destiny to rule the world. Chiliasm was the assertion of the fact, that Christianity is related, positively as well as negatively, to the world. Chiliasm declared that Christianity, by renouncing, was called to glorify the world. Chiliasm was *the fruit and sign* of the advance of Christendom to the conviction that nature is destined, by its inmost essence and idea, to stand in a positive relation to spirit. The truth which it asserted justly claimed a realization by Christendom at every stage of its existence in even higher forms and increasing measure." Grosse (pastor at Bridford, England, 1647; quoted by *Lond. Quart. Journal of Proph.*, 1855, p. 194) declares: "No man rightly desires Christ's Coming, but he that hath assurance of the good and benefit of His Coming. To them the day of Christ is as the day of harvest to the husbandman, as the day of deliverance to the prisoner, as the day of coronation to the king, as the day of wedlock to the bride—a day of triumph and exaltation, a day of freedom and consolation, a day of rest and satisfaction; to them the Lord Jesus is all sweetness, as wine to the palate and ointment to the nostril, saith Solomon; honey in the mouth, saith Bernard; music in the ear, and a jubilee in the heart. Get assurance of Christ's Coming, as a ransomer to redeem you, as a conqueror to subdue all your enemies under you, as a friend to comfort you, as a king to honor you, as a physician to heal you, as a bridegroom to marry you, and *then* shall you with confidence and boldness, with joy and gladness, with vehement and holy longings, say, '*Come Lord Jesus.*'" Col. Rawlandson (*Ch. Herald*, Oct. 30th, 1879) remarks: "The Christian who puts away from him the doctrine of the Sec. Coming of the Lord puts away *his strength*, and is like a *wounded lark*, unable to soar to elevated heights. He who looks for his reunion with his Lord only at the hour of death, is like the maimed bird, and cannot sing anything but Lenten dirges. It is a sad thing thus to shut out the comfort and joy of this precious hope." Roos (*Interpretation of Daniel*) says: "It is revealed, not to satisfy curiosity, but *to strengthen* our faith and *to quicken* our hope. It is easy for us to bear good and joyful events whenever they come, though they are not circumstantially foretold. But it consoles a Christian, who is often grieved and distressed, in these dark times, and who has a zeal for the honor of Jesus Christ and His Kingdom, to look for-

ward to the golden times, when all *pia desideria* will be fulfilled and realized, and to see them, even now, in the mirror of the divine Word." Janeway (*Voice of the Church*, p. 180) was, by grace, enabled to declare : " Of this I am confident, through infinite mercy, that the very meditation of that day hath *ever ravished* my soul ; and the thought of the certainty and nearness of it is *more refreshing* to me than the comforts of the world." Dr. Goodwin (Address before the Proph. Conference at New York) stated in reference to our doctrine : " I take it into my heart and into my life because, above all things else, I have been driven on my knees in spite of the most resolute and determined antagonisms bred in the head and bred in the blood not to accept ; because it is to me the clear, unmistakable truth of God ; because it carries in it *the vitals* of Christianity, *the hopes* of the Church, *the glory* of God and the ages." It is corroborative that at this Proph. Conference, so largely attended, the practical nature of the doctrine was repeatedly asserted by such men as Drs. Tyng, Kellogg, Gordon, Imbrie, Mackay, Parsons, Nicholson, Brookes, Craven, Cooper, West, Duffield, Clark, and others. One of the resolutions adopted embraces its practical side : " The duty of the Church during the absence of the Bridegroom is to watch and pray, to work and wait, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, and thus hasten the Coming of the day of God ; and to His latest promise '*Surely I come quickly*,' *to respond, in joyous hope*, '*Even so ; come Lord Jesus.*'" Lange's *Com.* 1 *Thess.* (p. 50) quotes Chrysostom as saying : " To keep the Coming of the Lord at all times before our eyes, that is to be likeminded with the Apostles ;" and Rieger as declaring : " In the Gospel, the Lord's Coming shines in upon us so near, that it affords us already at every step much light for our feet." (Comp. Lange's comments, *Com. James*, p. 144.)

Obs. 9. Our doctrine, if entertained merely as a speculation or " splendid theory" with which reason may entertain itself, or as a basis from which to excite the curiosity of others by rash prophetical interpretations, by chronological calculations fixing the exact date of the Advent, and by dogmatical self-exclusiveness, cannot possibly be of much practical value. A man may hold the doctrine theoretically, and even present portions of it in a brilliant manner, *without having his heart or life touched by it*, as e.g. evidenced by his irascible, morose temper, his invectives upon all who disagree from him, his intense bigotry, his special claims of divine enlightenment. The doctrine legitimately produces love, brotherly love.

We cannot be too guarded in the practical application of truth. A Bacon, with his high and instructive teaching, fell through his love of money ; Solomon, with his wisdom and knowledge, was dragged down by sensuality ; multitudes, with large advancements in learning and splendid abilities, have sacrificed honor and character, in neglecting to do the divine will. Any doctrine can be held intellectually or speculatively without producing any effect on heart and life ; so this doctrine can be entertained, as illustrated by some painful examples. To have a proper influence, it must become (James 1 : 21) " *an ingrafted word* " in which we feel and realize a personal interest, urging to faith and holy living, to patience and endurance, to hope and love, or (as Brookes expressed it at the Conference) " make the Coming of Jesus *a practical and life-controlling fact* in our daily experiences." Auberlen (Lange's *Com.* 1 *Thess*, p. 25) remarks : " We must be in earnest with the expectation of Christ's Coming, if we would stand in the fulness of apostolic Christianity. This carries with it (1) a warning (*a*) against every kind of worldly happiness and service of perishable things and men, especially against the modern absorption in practical and theoretic materialism, even of a refined sort ; (*b*) against the Romanizing overvaluing of what we already have even in the Church, and against striving for the Church's outward dominion and glory ; (*c*) against false ideals of a great future of the life of nations, to be introduced by our own, be it even Christian, power and activity ; and against the so frequent intermixture, concurrent therewith, of the world and the Kingdom of God ; (2) comfort (*a*) in regard to imperfections and sins in ourselves, in the world, in the Church ; it has not yet appeared what we shall be (1 John 3 : 2) ; (*b*) in regard to the sufferings and afflictions, which are the divinely appointed way to the future glory, 2 Cor. 4 : 17 sq., Rom. 8 : 17." Compare also Riggenbach (same, p. 78–79) who, at length, insists on its personal application, saying : " The certainty that the Lord is Coming with His salvation, is so stirring, bright, overpowering, that the man who is full of it says : *Quickly.*" The doctrine must be enforced by a personal application, illustrated

e.g. by Philpot (*The Priest upon His Throne*, p. 285): "Am I looking for the Coming of the Lord? Amid the conflicts of the wilderness am I wearing 'for an helmet the hope of salvation?' and having that hope, am I 'purifying myself even as He is pure?' If these questions can be met with confidence, *then* is there animating proof that our hope of seeing the Coming Saviour as He is, and reigning with Him on the earth, is a sure and 'blessed hope;' and 'the day of the Lord will not overtake us as a thief in the night;' yea, rather, it will accomplish our 'perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory.'" So Noel (*Brief Inquiry*, p. 124): "If the reign of Christ be not first within our renewed souls, we shall never share it in a renewed world. If He legislate not over our passions and our affections, we shall never bear rule in the regions of His rescued earth. If God the Holy Ghost regenerate not our hearts, He will never regenerate our bodies. Our conformity to Christ must be entire. We must first be crucified ere we can be glorified. His sceptre must be in our hearts ere His crown can rest upon our heads." Ten thousand such practical directions could be quoted from eminent Pre-Millenarians of the past and the present. It would be a sad, sad thing, a terrible calamity, if we should proclaim the Sec. Advent as "the Blessed Hope," and the Kingdom as containing joy unspeakable and fulness of glory *and yet fail* to find acceptance at the one and admission into the other; if we should urge those who know what sorrow and sighing and tears mean to live in such faith and hope and love that sorrow and sighing may flee away and tears be wiped from all faces at the glorious revelation of Jesus, *and yet*, after all our warnings to others, multiply our own sorrow, sighing, and tears. Alas! when men professedly hold to this hope and teach it, and yet exhibit a most unamiable temper, an unforgiving disposition, and other unchristian manifestations, we have reason to apprehend their dangerous condition, or, *at least*, their liability to great loss in future position.

Obs. 10. We should be thus affected not merely by the present practical influence upon the heart and life, or by the reception of it to lead (2 Tim. 3 : 17) the man of God to "be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," but likewise by *the ultimate benefit* to be derived from such a position, the divine approval and reward at the judgment of believers (Prop. 135 and 130). We may rest assured that a reverent reception of the commands and teaching on these subjects will not only prevent our suffering loss, but increase our ultimate reward, because those who *thus honor* God will eventually *be honored* by Him.

It is *no small matter*, *when* the Scriptures are so full of it, *when* the cautions and warnings are so pertinent, *when* the injunctions are so precise and direct, to turn away from it and influence others to reject it. Such assume a heavy responsibility that must be met; and the plea of superior piety, increased spirituality, honoring of Christ, or ignorance, will avail nothing before the plain teaching of the Word. Some think that by a continuous adhesion to "milk," "the first principles," they are advancing in the divine favor and assure themselves of a reward, but even such "milk" is diluted and weakened by the rejection of the "cream" and the "meat" imparted by our doctrine; faith and hope are dwarfed, comfort and strength diminished, and the final reward is lessened. If God, under the penalty of excommunication, prohibited even the making of the anointing oil and perfume (Ex. 30), it should teach us that He is equally careful to preserve His truth from adulteration, and no one can, therefore, add to it or reject it without incurring guilt. If He destroyed Nadab and Abihu for introducing innovations in rites and ceremonies, it may well be considered whether He, a God jealous of His own truth, will not be displeased if we innovate by substitution, spiritualizing, etc. Thus to illustrate: Waldegrave (*The New Test. Millenarianism*) concludes his work with a reference to personal religion (excellent and essential), but in such a way that it is taught that if such is secured, then these things can be properly and safely neglected; as e.g. "O my Saviour, while others weary themselves with the disquisition of Thy personal reign here upon earth for a thousand years, let it be the whole bent and study of my soul to make sure of my personal reign with Thee in heaven to all eternity." (The reader will observe (1) the charge of "wearying" and (2) as if we limited the reign to one thousand years.) Thus a *false hope* is made a motive power, and he makes himself chargeable with slighting *an oath-bound* covenant, "the sure mercies of David," and *the plainest* promises relating to the glory of Christ and His saints. Not only so, but he endeavors with might and main

to lead others to a similar neglect and contempt. Surely such an one must bear his *self-imposed* burden, and give *an account* for his lack of faith. Thousands are in this category. To many Isa. 42 : 18–20 is still applicable, for the proverb of Ezek. 12 : 22 is virtually promulgated by them. Isa. 66 : 5 will be verified. The spirit of Ezek. 13 : 2, 6, 7, 10, 16 is carried out in the vain predictions of "peace and safety," and God will, certainly, hold such accountable. Some by a time-serving, man-fearing, prudential spirit refrain from accepting or proclaiming these things, lest they be designated enthusiasts or fanatics, and thus become unpopular. Such will meet the decision of a Saviour, *who urged them* not to fear man, not to be influenced by a seeking after their personal popularity, but to receive and present the truth *as given*. The ignoring, substitution, apologizing for non-reception, neglect, etc., will assume very different proportions from those now presented, *when* standing before the Judge to render an account for the same. There is something heart-searching in Luke 19 : 14 ; for of many who profess to love Jesus (but do not desire His personal Coming and presence) it may be said : "But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us." Many virtually do this very thing, by their emphatic and decided hostility to the doctrine of the imminency of the Sec. Advent ; for they treat it as if the personal Coming, instead of being "the blessed hope" and a joyful event to the believer, were something to be deplored and resisted.

Obs. 11. We insist, in view of what has been said, that our Pre-Millenarian doctrine stands forth *pre-eminent* as practical. The subjects, the hopes, the warnings and cautions, the attitude of watching, the heart-familiarity with eschatology, the incited study of prophecy, the stimulated meditations on grand themes, the glory and blessedness revealed—all serves to make it most conducive to piety and godly love. Brookes (Address before Proph. Conference), speaking of the important relations of the Sec. Advent as specified in the Bible, well says : "It may almost be said to form the basis of every argument, to give direction to every appeal, to fill out every exhortation, to terminate every warning ; so that it is to other truth as a foundation to the building, as a feather to the arrow, as ripened fruit to the bud and blossom, as eternity to time."

The same writer in *Maranatha*, after having passed over the Scriptural use of the doctrine of the Second Advent, showing how it is employed as a motive under forty distinct aspects, beyond that of every other doctrine (being, as Rev. Ker expressed it, "moreover in the New Test., the great event *that towers above* every other"), adds the following : "Can the same be said of any other doctrine whatever? Is it employed in the same manner now in the preaching of the modern pulpit? Of course it will be asserted that it is, but the assertion may be met by a flat denial ; and the reader can judge for himself *how often* he has heard it mentioned in sermons, or in prayers, since he first began to attend the ministry of the word and the meetings of the saints. He may have heard frequent mention made of death, or the judgment, or heaven, or hell, but *how seldom* he has listened to a distinct statement, or even a faint reference, concerning the Coming of the Lord. This is not written to find fault or to censure thousands of excellent brethren, who only need to have their attention awakened to a neglected truth ; but it is important to show that the manifold practical uses made of the Second Advent by the inspired writers ought to be made of it still, if we accept of the sacred Scriptures as the infallible rule of faith and practice. A Rationalist may sneer at the ever-recurring testimony of these Scriptures with regard to the Second Coming of our Lord, but all who bow to their authority as the very Word of God must, after examination, place the doctrine here advocated *very high* in their esteem. Their experience will be something like that of the gifted and saintly Hewitson, of whom his biographer says : "The blessed hope took its place thenceforth, not only in his understanding, but *in his heart*. He not only believed in the speedy appearing—he *loved* it—*waited* for it—*watched* for it. 'Faith,' we find him saying, 'looks back to the cross, and is at peace ; it looks forward to the crown, and pants for glory. Oh, to have more of the life and power of such a faith !' So mighty a motive power did it become, that he used to speak of it ever afterward as bringing with it a kind of second conversion. It is interwoven with the texture of his whole future life." Lange (*Com.*, Matt. 24) remarks : "Christians, waiting in a heavenly frame of mind for their Lord, will find that He is their Friend, their legitimate Lord, their

Royal Bridegroom. If they think of His coming with an earthly mind, He appears to them as a thief who will strangely and unrighteously break in upon their earthly relations and possessions." "Readiness for Christ's Advent diffuses somewhat of the brightness of His future glorification over life." Hence Trench (*On the Parables*) observes that the leaving the time of the Advent indefinite presents a "powerful motive to holiness and diligence, supplied to each generation of the faithful by the possibility of the Lord's return in their time"—it being designed that all should be impelled by it, and enabled to rejoice in its preciousness. Its pre-eminent practical power is seen in the apostolic age, in the believers formed under their preaching—in the Primitive Church, in confessors and martyrs, in a host of pious, devoted, and useful followers of Jesus; it will again be seen and realized with overwhelming power when the martyrs are sustained by it under the death-dealing persecution of the culminated Antichrist. The spirit of Hab. 2 : 1-4 is constantly made manifest. The Jews feel its practical bearing now, and hundreds have been converted under its influence, and the day is coming when thousands, yea the nation itself, will respond to its motive power. It separates more and more from the present world, and causes us to fix our hopes and affections on that which is to come. It fills the mind and heart with God's truth, and enables us calmly to look at events transpiring in the light of revelation. It enables us with Dr. Tyng (Hill's *Saints' Inheritance*, p. 271) to say: "In the great view of the Saviour's personal reign on a regenerated earth, as the final and everlasting abode of His redeemed, I rest *with confidence and delight.*" We conclude with quoting Stewart's declaration and wish (*Lectures during Lent*, p. 351 and 355): "If there be any one topic more than another calculated to solemnize the mind, to bring us as lowly suppliants to the throne of grace, and to lead to watchfulness and prayer, while at the same time it cheers and animates the spirit, filling it with that blessed hope which led the apostles, the army of martyrs, and, we may add, our Protestant forefathers to 'count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus their Lord'—if there be any subject calculated to produce these blessed effects, *it is 'the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.'*" "Oh, that the Holy Spirit, of His infinite mercy and goodness, would deeply impress our minds with this important truth; so that, instead of being like those to whom the Lord shall come unawares, we may be of *that happy number* who are making ready for His appearing, and who, when He does come, shall be able to say, '*Lo! this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation.*'"

Obs. 12. One objection, constantly reiterated, notwithstanding its abundant answer, deserves special attention, as it is paraded to prove the impracticable tendency of our doctrine. It is asserted that our doctrine tends to injure missions and destroy their spirit. We emphatically pronounce this a baseless slander cast upon noble believers of the past, and which originates not merely in ignorance of the facts, but arises from a desire to make our belief odious. We have shown in another place *how largely* the missionary spirit pervaded the early Chiliastic believers, how missionaries, founders of missions, evangelists, ministers of extended usefulness, martyrs, etc., were express Chiliasts, and, therefore, how any one, in the face of such overwhelming testimony, can reproduce and urge such a false accusation, we leave others to judge. Look at the legitimate outgrowth of the doctrine as evidenced in the lives of men who held that the design of this dispensation was to save them (out of all nations) that believe, to gather out a people for His name; who taught that it was the duty of the Church to preach the Gospel to every creature and aid in this outgathering in order to hasten the glorious manifestation and Kingdom; who declared that, in view of the uncertainty and shortness of time, special diligence and activity were demanded; who expressed the earnest hope that, by their labors in winning souls to the Christ, they might increase their present and eternal joy; and who emphatically announced that their faith in these things confirmed them, and urged them on, in efforts to bring sinners to Jesus. Because we do not allow ourselves to be enthused with a

false hope (viz., that of the conversion of the world in the present dispensation), this charge is made, when the whole tendency of our doctrine—if heartily embraced—is to make us solicitous of the salvation of others, so that they with us may reign with Christ, inheriting His Kingdom and glory.

We write plainly and with deep feeling, because in our researches we have repeatedly met this objection, asserted again and again as if it had never obtained a reply. Some of our opponents are too Christian in spirit and feeling to reproduce it; others, however, seem to esteem it a choice morsel of "bitter herbs." The reader is referred to Prop. 175, Obs. 2, and note; Prop. 156, Obs. 9, 16; Prop. 158, Obs. 8, and note, etc., for quotations of this objection (several in most offensive, wholesale terms indicative of the spirit) for our defence, and for a reference to eminent and pious Chiliasts actuated by a missionary spirit and renowned as missionaries. We are sorry to be compelled (in self-defence) thus to refer to and meet such a detracting charge, but the eminence given to it and the apparent weight of authority is so well calculated to mislead and prejudice that it deserves our attention. The unfounded charge is even repeated by Dr. Fisher in the art. "Millennium" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, for he says: "The tendency of the Millenarian theory to chill the hopes, and thus repress the missionary activity of Christians by exhibiting the world as in a progress of deterioration, and by representing the efforts of Christians to convert mankind as fruitless until the Coming of Christ, constitutes not the least serious objection to such opinions." Nearly every work against us contains the same, often expressed with bitterness and scorn. The most unfair contrasts (as e. g. *Princeton Review*, Ap., 1851, Art. "Foreign Missions and Millenarianism") are instituted by suppressing the facts in reference to missionaries, and the actual faith held by us. We may well ask Dr. Fisher what Pre-Millenarian ever held the view "that the efforts of Christians to convert mankind were fruitless" (when they expressly teach, Mark 16 : 15, 16; Luke 24 : 47; Jno. 17 : 20, etc.), or ever sought to "repress the missionary activity of Christians" (when many of them were successful missionaries themselves). We may well ask, did ever Luther, Calvin, and a host of others, who did not hold to the Whitbyan theory of a universal conversion, but did hold "the world as in a progress of deterioration," repress missionary activity, and represent Christian efforts at conversion a failure or fruitless? The charge is too sweeping, and *defeats itself;* it is too denunciatory, and *recoils* upon its originators and abettors. Dr. Randolph (the Kentucky *Tribune*, Feb. 13th, 1880) has well said: "No man of common intelligence ought to be willing to risk the statement that the preaching of Christ's speedy coming tends to paralyze missionary exertion. *As a question of fact it is not true.* First, and above everything else, the Bible contradicts the assertion. The parables of Jesus contradict it. The history of the Apostolic Church contradicts it. The history of the Post-Apostolic Church contradicts it. The great and overwhelming fact that a majority of the missionaries in the foreign field to-day are Pre-Millenarians, in thunder tones contradicts it. What must be the attitude of those who, in the face of such evidence, stand up to repeat these *thoroughly exploded* objections? The only answer that can be made is—it can only be due to ignorance, want of comprehension, or blind and incurable prejudice." The concession of Barnes and fifty-nine others respecting the early Church (Prop. 156, Obs. 9, 16) is already decisive. The challenge of Wood's and Garbett (same) has never yet been met. Dr. Brown's (Prop. 175, Obs. 2, note) assertions respecting our position cannot be maintained in consistency with the truth. Steele's (Prop. 158, Obs. 8 and note) declarations lack proof, and are erroneous deductions, putting into our faith that which we positively discard. The evidence of Pre-Millenarians being actively engaged as missionaries is cumulative. (Comp. e. g. that given by Lord, Wilson etc., note to Prop. 158, Obs. 8). One of the editors of the *Proph. Times* (vol. 10, p. 111) declares that a missionary "remarked to us that, including British missionaries, two thirds of those now engaged in this work in India are Millenarians;" (and, in connection, gives Dr. Kellogg's testimony to the faith of the recently deceased missionary, Rev. Joseph H. Myers, published in the *Presbyterian*, May 18th, 1872). The Hermansburg congregation, that has done so much for missions, does not regard the looking for the speedy Advent (comp. *Proph. Times*, vol. 5, p. 40) as adverse to, but provocative of, a missionary spirit. The eminent missionaries mentioned in other connections (as e. g. under the History of the Doctrine) speak for themselves. So e. g. West (*Address* before the Proph. Conference) refers to "devoted missionaries like Duff, the opener of India, Gutslaff, the opener of China, Bettleheim, the opener of Japan, Heber, Bertram, Wolff, Herschell, Poor, Lowry, and many more were Pre-Millenarians, and are followed, if recent informa-

tion is correct, by a majority of missionaries now in the foreign field of the same faith." With such names and lives before him, *how* can an opponent repeat this gross, unwarranted charge! We are glad to record the fact that enlightened Christian opposers do not urge it. Thus e. g. Dr. Paterson in Art. "Pre-Millenarianism" (*Princeton Review*, 1878, p. 415) pointedly asserts: "One charge, however, which is made against it, is *unjust*—that it must cut the nerve of preaching and missionary effort," and adds: "For ourselves we confess that among our personal friends who hold this error are *the most spiritually minded* of Christians and *the most earnest and successful* of pastors and preachers." As an indication and practical illustration of Pre-Millenarian feeling on the subject, we call attention to the late "Prophetic Conference" held at New York (1878) in Dr. Tyng's church, where over three hundred ministers and a large audience adopted, as a decided expression of belief and practice, the following resolution: "*Resolved*: That the doctrine of our Lord's Pre-Millennial Advent, instead of paralyzing evangelistic and missionary efforts, is one of *the mightiest incentives* to earnestness in preaching the Gospel to every creature 'till He cometh.'" Dr. Kellogg, himself formerly a missionary, testified to its being such in his own experience and in that of other missionaries; that out of his class (sixty graduates) at the Theological Seminary (where our doctrine was not taught) "there were in all seven men who appeared to go as foreign missionaries. They were, every one of them, Pre-Millenarians, and there was not a single other one in that class that so much as offered to go;" that "the objection has *no foundation*, either in logic, in facts, or the experience of Christian life." He emphatically announced that when in the mission field he took a census of the Presbyterian missionaries, with this result: "I know at that time the Pre-Millenarians, as proportioned to the others, were about two to one; and I am happy to remark, that two of those honored comrades of mine I have seen in this house to-day—missionary brethren—are both Pre-Millenarian." Major Whittle, the evangelist, gave a similar testimony how it incited him and other evangelists—"Henry, Varley, Moorehouse, Moody, and Needham—and all these beloved brethren in Christ through all the country so far as I know them. Certainly, I must protest in their name and in my own name against the statement that accepting the truths of the coming of Christ paralyzes missionary or evangelistic effort. It was *that* which sent me out in the field; it is *that* which has kept me in the field when oppressed by the flesh and the world." And in reference to the truths presented at the conference, he said: "I never felt in my life such an inspiration as I have felt after listening to these beloved brethren to go out and save souls, and to reach them and bring them to the Gospel and to the Lord Jesus Christ, that they may share with us in the coming glory." (So evident is it that the evangelists as a class are on our side, that Dr. Hall, of New York, in the *Presbyterian*—quoted in *Luth. Observer*, Dec. 6th, 1878—sounds the alarm, and warns the churches against those who entertain "Pre-Millennial views," and most falsely charges them as "getting ready themselves and preparing some others for entering 'Plymouth-brotherism,' if a man can be said to enter that which is without landmark or definite boundary.") Dr. Goodwin, at the same conference, said: "They tell us that we shall destroy the incentive to Christian effort, that we shall break up our mission-organization, that we shall dishearten the whole Church of Jesus Christ. But as for me—and, I believe, I am speaking for these brethren—the thought of the night that hastens, the thought of the woe that impends, the thought of the great shipwreck that is about us now, and the thought of the thousands that shall perish if they die unsaved, moves me to pray, Oh, that I may help to do with my might what my hands find to do! *That is why this doctrine is to me so sweet.* It makes prayer mighty; it makes Christ more; it makes souls exceedingly precious. Let us go home praying that the power of the doctrine may be in our hearts first, and then upon our lips and in our lives." Such testimony was also given by others. Rev. Dr. Mackay, at the Mildmay Conference (1879) refers to the extent that our views are held by missionaries, and states that a Pre-Millenarian missionary being asked, "Are you going to the heathen holding these pessimist views? What good will you do?" He replied: "I hold neither pessimist nor optimist views, or any such thing—I am a truthist," and then added, "If I did not hold these views *I would never go* to the heathen." Dr. Andrew Bonar (*Lond. Quart. Jour., Prophecy*, vol. 1, p. 317) declared: "He has heard missionaries 'regret deeply that the Church at home should be dazzled by the vain hope of conversions on a grand scale.' If the missionary would 'see that *the gathering out of the elect is his sole hope*,' he would be '*far less disheartened* by opposition than when he vainly expected every day to see symptoms of national and universal conversion." A returned missionary, Whitbyan in view, when abroad, informed me that with our doctrine he would have been greatly encouraged in his work, avoiding many discouragements and gloomy hours of despondency. For, as

Auriol (*Lects. during Lent*, p. 34): "Our Church teaches us to pray that the Lord would 'shortly accomplish the number of His elect, and hasten His Kingdom.' Will not a believer, to whom (after he has realized the great truths on which his own salvation rests) the speedy Coming of his Lord has become the chief object of earnest expectation—will not such an one be animated with *a most eager desire* to be an instrument, in the Lord's hand, for the fulfilment of those events which are yet to be accomplished? What a stirring echo to the longing of his own heart is the cry of the 'whole creation,' through sin and the miserable prevalence of heathenism, 'groaning and travailing with pain together until now!' What *a motive* for fervor and zeal in the missionary cause has he who can look at every soul converted to God as a fresh earnest of the near approach of the 'day of redemption!' When he thinks of the hopes set before him in connection with the Bridegroom's return, *how will he long* that many should 'come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of God.'" We only add that our doctrine sustains and strengthens a believer, whether largely successful or not, because he realizes that he is working for the Lord, and that the Lord at His coming will reward him; and that, at least, he is bearing "the witness" which is a necessary antecedent to the blessed consummation. It is reported that the result of the Mildmay Prophetic conference (1879) was the commission of eight young men to the foreign field, and that of other conferences is equally striking. Nast (*Com.*, Matt. 24: 49) pronounces the idea that the Pre-Millennial doctrine has a tendency to "dampen missionary zeal" as unfounded, quotes Buck (*Harm and Expos*) as showing that watching for the Advent tends, necessarily, to wean men from the world, to make them solicitous to save others, to make them liberal in their contributions, to cause them to consume less in self-gratification, etc. Those who urge this charge against us virtually affirm that we ought not to look, watch, and pray for the Second Advent lest we weaken Christian effort; that to make and develop missionary zeal we must declare that "My Lord delayeth His Coming" until the world is converted; that "the blessed hope" which inspired so many in the past has lost its power in the improved development of the modern Church; that the early Church, missionaries, and all who entertained it, were not nearly as well equipped for activity and service as those who have put on the Whitbyan panoply; and that the appeals and motives urged by Harris's *Great Commission*, and kindred works based on "the conversion of the world" are a decided improvement on the lack of such appeals and motives in the New Testament. What must we think of a theory, which sets itself up as directly antagonistic to some of *the plainest injunctions* of the Word? Brookes (*Maranatha*, p. 384–5) quotes a letter received by himself "from Rev. Dr. J. Newton, one of the oldest, and certainly one of the most devoted and honored of the Presbyterian missionaries in India, in which he incidently writes: '*A large proportion* of the missionaries I am acquainted with, both American and English, are looking forward to the Advent of Christ and the establishment of His glorious Kingdom on earth as events which are to consummate our hopes both for ourselves and the nations. It is sometimes said that these views of prophecy have an anti-missionary tendency. But it so happens that *many of the most earnest and hard-working* missionaries are just the men who are most widely known as Millenarians.'" To this Brookes adds: "Other missionaries testify that perhaps four fifths of the young men who leave this country to carry the tidings of salvation to the heathen embrace the doctrine of Christ's Pre-Millennial Advent, and that, too, in the face of the powerful influence of their theological training. They leave their homes deeply prejudiced against the doctrine, or profoundly ignorant of it, and yet, as a rule, they do not remain long in dark and distant lands before they become, as was the case with Walter Lowrie and many others, its enthusiastic advocates." Dr. Duff, in his speech (1850) before the Scotch General Assembly, showed that if Pre-Millennialists ignored missions, it was *against* their acknowledged principles. He said: "I desire not to dogmatizeon the subject. All I would say is, that whether the one or the other view (Pre- or Post-Millennial) be true, our duty is to do all in our power until the trumpet shall sound. This is the practical result. If we believed that to-morrow at noon the trumpet would sound, methinks, instead of resting from our labors, none of us ought to go to sleep, but would take our stand upon the watch-tower, and proclaim to a slumbering people, *Awake!* Arise! for to-morrow is the Day of Doom. If I believed that to-morrow at twelve o'clock the world would come to an end, I would take no sleep, but would be up and doing. And if we believe that the Dispensation is approaching its end, this, instead of paralyzing us, ought only to induce those who are called Pre-Millenarians, of all others, to go forth and preach in all lands, in a mighty phalanx, sounding the alarm."

In addition: To indicate the unfairness with which our doctrine is treated in this

direction, we refer to the remarks made upon Dr. Seiss's refusal to affiliate with the Moody and Sankey movement in Philadelphia. The *Methodist Recorder* and other papers deemed this a good opportunity to aim sarcasms at Pre-Millenarianism, as if that was the cause of the doctor's refusal, when (1) Moody himself was a Pre-Millenarian ; (2) when many Post-Millenarians take precisely the same attitude toward lay evangelism that Dr. Seiss does ; (3) when Dr. Seiss distinctly grounded his refusal, not upon Millenarian grounds, but upon his views of Church organization, the ministry, the system of indoctrinating applicants for Church membership, and the abuses of evangelism ; (4) when the doctor, as editor of the *Prophetic Times*, several times alluded to Moody as a Millenarian and Christian ; (5) and when many Pre-Millenarians cordially aid lay evangelism, not being controlled by the conscientious scruples and motives influencing Dr. Seiss. The doctor is warmly attached to missions, has ably seconded missionary effort, and is himself a successful preacher. His Church view forces him, as a matter of consistency, to think that all effort of this kind is to be promoted in, what he conceives, a legitimate way under a regularly constituted ministry. These are views held *outside* of those entertained concerning our doctrine, and Millenarianism cannot be held accountable for them, just as Anti- or Post-Millenarianism cannot be for a similar position entertained by many of its advocates. The writer himself, not being trammelled by the scruples that influence others, wishes lay evangelism abundant success, indeed, every method to bring sinners to Jesus, provided proper prudence and wisdom is exercised to avoid self-deception and mere animal excitement. Guiness and many others, well-known writers and themselves active supporters of missionary enterprises, abundantly refute all such alleged objections.

PROPOSITION 184. *In this Kingdom will be exhibited a Manifested Unity.*

This is positively predicted, not only in reference to the Jews (Isa. 11 : 13 ; Ezek. 37 : 18–22, etc., excluding all envy, division, etc.), but in reference to the Gentiles, all being embraced in *one great universal Kingdom* to which all render obedience and homage (as e.g. Dan. 7 : 14, 27 ; Zech. 14 : 9, 16 ; Micah 4 : 1–7, etc.). A Theocracy so extended and realized, in the nature of the case, cannot tolerate disunion ; and under the rule of the supernaturally endowed King and His co-rulers *all tendencies* to separation, dissent and discord will be *effectually crushed.*

Obs. 1. Men have sought for *a present manifested unity* by misapprehending two things. (1) Unity is desirable, and it ought to exist, hence God commands it, and good men advocate and endeavor to exemplify it. God can do no less than to require it (just as He demands holiness, etc.), but does God teach us that it will be perfectly manifested in this dispensation ? Instead of teaching the preservation of outward unity, we are expressly taught to expect divisions, etc., even in the early Church (Acts 20 : 29, 30 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 17, 18, 19 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4, etc.). The condition of the Church down to the harvest, a mingling of tares and wheat, good and bad fish, foolish and wise virgins, *forbids the attainment of a manifested unity* however desirable to man and acceptable to God, seeing that *such* a mixture itself—*allowed for purposes of mercy*—is *productive of diversity.* Had an external unity been the aim of God, then undoubtedly the apostles would have presented us with a regular ecclesiastical government (something, perhaps, like the Papacy developed), Canon laws, a Synoptical Confession of Faith, etc. But we are told that, for wise purposes (as e.g. to test character, faith, life), diversity and antagonism were permitted, so that through trial and suffering, fighting and struggling, the faithful members may be perfected. God now *permits* many things, which in themselves are not agreeable to Him, and which form a source of sorrow to pious souls. The history of the Church is the best commentary on this subject. (2) Unity now, however, exists (not outwardly but) between Christ, the Head, and all faithful, believing members (inasmuch as *all* receive from Him *the same* blessings, spiritual life, etc.), and even between such believers when the inward religious experience is permitted to testify (for all having the same faith, the same graces of the Spirit, same experience in spite of denominational ties, the likeness in one will respond to the same in another), and, in view of this spiritual unity (the only one that is promised to exist in the present dispensation), many able and most amiable writers have supposed that it ought to be manifested outwardly in a general amalgamation of all denominations, or in some external union embracing the

various churches. Here, however, we must distinguish between things that differ. The union between Christ and His members is necessarily spiritual, invisible, until the day that He appears with them, and such union is openly revealed. The union between His members, resulting from the former, and evidenced by a like experience of grace and power, is undoubtedly to be evidenced by *an expression* of the same (as e.g. in the present alliances, public meetings of the representatives of various denominations, etc.), but irrespective (as now done) of particular forms of doctrine, church government, etc., being founded solely upon the religious experience of the individual believer, a common Church love and adhesion to the One Messiah. Outward diversity will, notwithstanding, necessarily exist.

Men, also, have been searching for a bond that might bind into historic union the past Christian centuries. The secular and ecclesiastical institutions, civil and religious wars, the State and Church persecutions, the antagonistic forces arrayed against each other—these with a multitude of facts cannot, however able writers attempt it, be compressed within a bond of unity. Civilization, Christianity, development, etc., do not meet and unite *the antagonism*. Philosophy and science vainly seek to unravel the mystery, and to account for the perversity manifested. Open the Bible, and it tells us that for certain reasons we are now in "*the times of the Gentiles*"—times that give no bond of unity owing to Gentile domination being *adverse* to the only influences that could develop the same. These are times in which truth and error, piety and wickedness, faith and unbelief, reason and cavil, etc., are to be exhibited *in constant conflict*. The unity is alone found in the Divine Purpose, which allows this period as a punishment to the Theocratic nation (i.e. the Jews), and as a mercy to the Gentiles (i.e. inviting to an engrafting, etc.). This very lack of unity externally is part of the Divine Plan, and its historic relationship is seen *when* the Divine Purpose is completed. Hence, we must not look for that which can only be made manifest at the end. Unity, in reference to the believer, is now found in what Julius Müller in the *Evang. Union* calls "an absolute and truthful surrender of one's self to the personal Saviour; a surrender of which the simplest child is capable." This leads to fellowship one with another, seeing that *the same mind* which was in Christ actuates all. That selfish, lordly, alleged holy, exclusiveness, characteristic of some, is not the fruitage of true Christian love; its source is human.

Obs. 2. Dr. Nevin, in his sermon, "Catholic Unity" (attached to *the Principle of Prot.*), justly reasons that unity is preserved even with a certain denominational diversity. Dr. Hodge, in his address (delivered before the Ch. Alliance at New York), "Union by Faith with Christ, the Basis of Christianity," defines this unity, pleading for its observance, and remarks that it does not exist in an external organized form or in an entire uniformity of doctrine or government. Dr. Schmucker, who wrote and labored much on this his favorite topic, correctly represents this unity, and advocated its expression (giving a detailed plan in *Fraternal Appeal*, etc.), without discarding a diversity, denominational organizations, which, as human nature now constituted, and as the visible church now established, could not be avoided in the freedom allowed to it. Others could be quoted maintaining the same position (see e.g. Barrows, "Dis. on the Unity of the Church"), the only tenable one; for even in single churches (as e.g. Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Episcopalian, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, etc.) *much diversity* exists either in doctrine or in other particulars, developing itself in direct antagonisms, so that unity at present must be placed where the Word places it, not in any outward organization, but in a common union in and with Christ. Our feelings must always be touched with the efforts of Bucer, Pareus, Calixtus, Dury, Grotius, Bossuet, and a host of others, to have, if possible, a manifestation of external unity; efforts that are at least honorable to their hearts, but, if designed to

secure an outward unity, *must prove futile down to the Sec. Advent.* It is a painful fact that we have large and small bodies of professing believers, who, discarding *a common* religious experience, make their own church or sect the exemplification of the Biblical idea of unity, and therefore either ignore the professions of all others, refusing to allow them to be also believers, or else, while thoretically conceding that they may be Christians, practically refuse them the title by debarring them from the Lord's table, etc. Numerous sad illustrations, implicating the names of excellent men actuated by sincerity and honesty, from past and present history, might be adduced to show *how hopeless* it is, according to the testimony of Scripture, to expect ever denominational differences to disappear in one grand outward union of the churches in this dispensation.

Gurney, of the Society of Friends, has pointed out in the following language (quoted by Neander, Pref. to *First Planting of the Church*) the basis of union, the bond of fellowship : " It can scarcely be denied that in that variety of administration, through which the saving principles of religion are for the present permitted to pass, there is much of a real adaptation to corresponding variety of mental condition. Well, therefore, may we bow with thankfulness before that infinite and unsearchable Being, who in all our weakness follows us with His love and through the diversified mediums of religion to which the several classes of true Christians are respectively accustomed, is still pleased to reveal to them all *the same crucified Redeemer* and to direct their footsteps *into one path* of obedience, holiness, and peace." The editor (Prof. Stuckenberg) of the *Luth. Evangelist*, Aug. 2d, 1878, has a sensible and needed article on the " Union of Believers," made important by the tendencies of unbelief, " on the basis (without discarding denominational peculiarities) of the fundamental doctrines and principles of Christianity, which are recognized by all evangelical churches." After quoting a German writer who insists upon such a union, because in the contest with unbelief " the very existence or non-existence of religion and theology is involved," the writer concludes : " That believer is to be pitied, who can look at the present attitude of infidelity, and can at the same time foster animosity among brethren. Unity in diversity, true Christian love between those of different churches, and hearty co-operation and true union of effort in the interests of Christianity, are possible now and are greatly needed." Alas ! how small a proportion of nominal Christianity responds to such sentiments ; it is only those who have largely imbibed the Spirit of Jesus that can and do feel such sentiments.

Obs. 3. Infidels may parade the differences, the antagonisms, and even the hostility of the various churches, and from this deduce the unreliability of Christianity, because a unity, which they assert is promised, is not manifested ; even Sir. Thomas Browne (*Relig. Med.*) may say : " It is the promise of Christ to make us all one flock ; but how and when this union shall be is as obscure to me as the last day ;" men may fondly dream of such a manifested unity still to come under prevailing instrumentalities, but the Bible gives *a decided answer* to all such objections, professions of ignorance, and visions of unity outwardly expressed, by directing us *onward* to the revelation of Christ, to the power which He shall exert in the overthrow of existing institutions, etc., and to the establishment of a new order of things in His Kingdom. If the Bible did not plainly predict the divisions, etc., of the church, *then* infidelity might bring in a plea ; if it did not as plainly locate the period when unity is to be manifested, *then* ignorance respecting it might be justly claimed ; and if it did not as plainly put the promised unity in the age to come, and as a result of Christ's established Kingdom, *then* dreams of present outward unity might be entertained. But with the Scriptures before us, and thus far amply sustained by the sad record of history, it is *impossible* to locate this manifested period otherwise. Let us take the strongest passages alleged against our

view, and, if properly considered, they fully sustain it. Thus e.g. the prayer of Jesus (John 17 : 21–26), "that they all may be one," etc., is linked with the time when all believers are gathered, and when His glory shall be revealed. So evident is this, if the parallel passages are also examined, that many of our opponents frankly admit this, as e.g. Origen (*De Prin.* B. 1, ch. 6), who locates the unity prayed for by Jesus in John 17 : 20, 21, in the future New Heavens and New Earth; and Pressense (*Early Years of Chris.*, p. 463) thinks that it will only be fulfilled at the return of Christ. Now, indeed, the believer is united to Christ, and feels that he is one with all God's dear children; but when the Bridegroom comes, and a blissful unity is manifested in the marriage consummated, *then* shall the world believe when it beholds *this wonderful unity and its resultant glory.*

A Roman Cath. writer, Joh. Ad. Mühler, presented the strongest defence of Roman Catholicism in his work, *Die Einheit der Kirche, od. das Princip des Catholicismus* (replied to by Nitsch, Bauer, etc.). Now whatever may be successfully alleged against the Eccles. unity there advocated, one thing is self-evident that in doctrinal unity it is historically opposed (as e.g. in this doctrine of the Kingdom) to the Primitive Church. No single denomination, whether Romish or Protestant, can set up such a claim, for a divergence, more or less apparent, can in every case be detected and exposed. This is so seriously felt that but few care to exhibit the same. We may say here that notwithstanding the high professions of union and the excellent advances made in this direction, there is but a small proportion of professed Christianity that entertains the proper mind and heart in this direction. It is with sadness that this confession is penned. Lest it be thought that our doctrinal position leads us to prejudge the matter, we leave an earnest advocate of union and no Millenarian to present his impressions. Rev. Dr. Wedekind (New York) in an article "About Christian Union; Is it in the Ascendant?" (the *Luth. Observer*, Aug. 16th, 1878) after giving interesting facts to substantiate his position, asserts that "it is evident that the loose talk so flippantly reiterated, that we live in a period when unionism and liberalism are making wonderful strides, is more of a sham than a reality. It is the intensest sect age in the entire history of the Church." "Out upon such transparent hypocrisy about Christian union! It is sham—nothing but a sham!" We feel assured that nothing but the judgments of God poured out—nothing but the dreadful period of persecution under Antichrist still future—can release the multitude from that intense sectism, bigotry, creedism, etc., so characteristic of the history of the Church past and present. The persecution that drove the primitive churches to love each other and to sacrifice the one for the other, will again perform its painful but good work.

Obs. 4. The Theocracy, in the King and His co-rulers, must necessarily exhibit *a oneness* subsisting between them; but the Bible also speaks of, embraced even in the notion of a *perfect* Theocratic government, a unity of the Kingdom resulting from a union of Church and State. This union men also *now* seek against the direct testimony of the Word; and in every instance, when attempted to be realized, with injurious results to the truth. The arguments e.g. employed by Dr. Curry (in his address, "Evils of a Union of Church and State," del. before Evang. Alliance for 1873) are emphatically forcible, and apply to this dispensation, indicating how impossible, without direct injury, it is safely to effect the same. But in this and similar addresses three things are *ignored*: (1) the emphatic predictions that such a union shall exist at some period in the future; (2) that it did once exist in the Theocracy, and that if the Theocracy is restored, as numerous prophecies declare, it must again be witnessed; (3) that such a union, however, is only safe, reliable, etc., under the direct personal auspices of Christ and His associated rulers, where God places it. Such a unity is pointed out in Isa. 2 : 1–5; Isa. 60, etc., when, through the mani-

fested unity of Christ and His brethren, all the relations of man, civil and religious, shall be brought under, and be directed by, a government, not only supreme, but *in harmonious unity*, the civil and the religious, the State and the Church *being united in the same great and glorious Head.*

Killen (*The Ancient Church*, p. 656), after having properly noticed what alone can produce unity in this dispensation (an internal unity of faith, hope, and affection), as opposed to the Romish idea of external unity, finally predicts that this unity will eventually be realized in the present dispensation, and as proof of his correctness quotes these three Scriptures, viz., Isa. 40 : 4, 5 ; Isa. 52 : 8, and Zech. 14 : 9. But let the student glance at the passages named and he will find that *they are linked* with the Coming of God, the Messiah, and all His saints, with the deliverance and restoration of the Jewish nation, with the setting up of a glorious Kingdom and the introduction of events that other Scriptures declare are not to be witnessed down to the Sec. Advent. The position that we have assumed is *impregnable*, seeing that it is based, not on isolated passages torn from their connection, but on the expressed statements and analogy of the whole Word of God. "Believers," "Christadelphians," "Seventh-Day Adventists," and others, speak loudly of "man's concocted churches," and urge some painful facts from the history of the past, and then to make things better multiply sectism. They insist upon a separation from all others and a union with themselves as the only proper scriptural position. None but endeavors to prove that they alone are guided, exclusively, by God and His Word through the Spirit. None but proceed—also Scripture or Spirit-derived—to erect as their minds or imaginations are directed—another organization or society, and then claim that in it alone is found the unity desirable. But this union is only specious, for the diversities of opinion, the disagreements of parties (thus e.g. in this city, Springfield, the Christadelphians, or followers of Thomas, form three separate, small parties, hostile to each other), evidence, what past history so painfully teaches, and what the practical spirit of Christianity entails, that unity in a common centre Jesus, in a common love to God and man, etc., is the only unity that we can expect in this dispensation, owing to the depravity of man. However sincere or honest such brethren are, *they only increase the evils* by separation, antagonisms, and sectism. Alas! *how many*—diverse one from the other—challenge our acceptance as the Christ-founded, the only true Church, possessing the only true faith and practice. We may safely lay it down as a rule, that *the louder* this claim is urged and *the more pretentious* it is made, *the less credence* should be given to it, seeing that in its intense bigotry and intolerance it violates at every step the greatest of Christian graces, love. The efforts made by the "Christo Sacrum" (1801) "to unite all denominations on the basis of the divinity of Christ and redemption by the merits of His passion," met with but little success ; other efforts since made have proven a failure, and it is only in the addresses of Prof. Flint, Dr. Dykes, and others (in the Pan-Presbyterian Council, 1877) that the only scriptural basis is found, viz., an agreement in essentials, allowing diversity to exist. In the interval between the two stages, persecution and bitter trial will draw believers together.

PROPOSITION 185. *This doctrine enforces that of Divine Providence.*

God is not indifferent to the establishment of this Theocratic Kingdom, and His divine oversight respecting it is constantly made manifest, e.g. in the selection, training, and covenant with Abraham, in the selection, adoption, and covenant with David, in the selection of Mary and the birth of Jesus, in the announcements made of His Purpose, in the provisions established to carry out to ultimate completion the Theocratic conception.

Obs. 1. God has a Divine Sovereignty and exercises it (Props. 79, 80); a definite Divine Purpose and will perform it (Isa. 14 : 26, 27); a predetermined Theocratic Plan, which will be accomplished (Prop. 2); oath-bound designs, which will be realized (Prop. 50); an omnipotence in Providence that is irresistible (Jer. 18 : 2–6); an end in view that will result according to His will (Rom. 9 : 9–21). From the beginning to the end of this doctrine, as given in Scripture, from the inception of the Theocratic idea to its final perfect realization, God stands before us as One who is *personally interested* in the matter, and who, for the sake of His own honor, praise, and glory, overrules all to bring forth, at the appointed time, a glorious consummation that shall vindicate and embellish the Divine perfections enlisted and employed in this grand redemptive work.

Even *now* we can clearly see that the Divine Purpose, as exhibited in the Plan of Redemption and culminating in the Theocratic ordering, evinces a Supreme Being, who upholds and governs all things. The outlines of this Purpose, the provisionary arrangements, the bestowal of certain covenants to certain persons, the guidance and announcements, the Coming of the Messiah, the establishment of the Church, etc., already indicate the perfections of God definitely employed in its behalf. But what must be our conception of Divine Providence *when* the Kingdom is once established in all its splendor and blessedness, vindicating the wisdom and knowledge, the goodness and power, the mercy and love of our God? The study of that Providence, the contemplation of its resultant work, the experience of it in past suffering and present deliverance, the consideration of it under the curse and under glorification, will exalt God in our minds and forever make Him the Supreme in our hearts. The Sec. Advent will maintain, in a halo of glory, the Divine Providence, for it itself is the sublime and joyful result of Providence. *Now* we see through a glass darkly, but *then* clearly; *now*, because of our limited understanding, we may be unable to form a perfect Theodicy, *then* it will be constructed, and all will understand the wonderful ways of the Lord.

Obs. 2. The Providence of God, both general and particular, is sufficiently evidenced in the call of Abraham; the raising up of the Jewish nation; the distinction made between Esau and Jacob; the history of Joseph; the removal from Egypt; the establishment of a Theocratic Kingdom; the varied transactions of that Kingdom; the care of good and punishment of wicked kings; the raising up of prophets; the re-

moval of the Theocracy; the provisions made for its re-establishment; the rejection of the nation; the call of the Gentiles; the destruction of Jerusalem, and in hundreds of particulars; so much so that the student of the Theocratic Plan is constantly impressed with it, and feels it to be *a living reality* in which he can evermore trustingly confide. Every step in the progress of events, every unfolding of time, every reference to the Theocratic ordering, every provision made for the future Messianic Kingdom teaches him that underlying all, and having control over all, *is a Divine Providence* which has occupied itself with the high and the low, the lofty and the minute, the nation and the individual, the rich and the poor, the happy and the suffering, the pious and the wicked—all tending toward *the one great goal* in the future.

A Pre-Millenarian must, from the very nature of his faith, be a strong believer in Providence. The Theocratic idea as developed in the past, and as predicted to be realized in the future at the Second Coming of "the Son of Man," necessarily embraces, *as fundamental, and essential*, an existing, superintending Providence. It enforces a thousand Scripture declarations respecting that Providence in preservation, control over nature, birth, life, disease, death, affliction, prosperity, trial, adversity, rewards, punishments, etc. And all this not simply mediately, but at pleasure (if requisite) immediately, as is finally evidenced at the Sec. Advent, when both mediate and immediate power is exercised *far beyond anything* that has yet been experienced. It, therefore, inspires prayer with faith, and worship with hope and joy; it imparts tranquillity to the mind and confidence to the heart; it animates, comforts, strengthens, and blesses; it makes God as our Father, and Jesus as our Brother, those who care for us, who manifest their interest in, and love for us, who even (Rom. 8 : 28) cause "*all things to work together for good to them that love God who are the called according to His purpose.*"

Obs. 3. The *special* Providence of God is most remarkably enforced and illustrated in the birth and life of David's Son, and in the continuous provision made for the future re-establishment of the Theocracy under the supervision of this Son and His associated rulers. It is seen in the striking acts of that life and its results; it is witnessed in the perpetuation of the Church by which a people are gathered out for the Kingdom; it is seen in the qualified and waiting King; it is witnessed in the people, designed for associated rulers, in the process of formation. The announcement, the star, the birth, the flight to Egypt—all in the life, the death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of this covenanted seed proclaim it; the call of the apostles, the founding of the Church, the gathering out of the nations—all in the work of procuring co-heirs with the Christ, announce it. We behold this Providence encircling us, embracing us, aiding us, elevating us, and finally crowning us.

It confirms within us a self-consciousness of *our constant dependence* upon God and His *loving care* for us. Faith in the Theocratic idea and glory embracing even us in a personal present realization of its provisionary measures, urges us on to increased trust and hope, purity of heart and life, watchfulness and reverent submission, patient confidence in the ultimate result. The pattern set by the life, teachings, and acknowledgments of the King are not lost upon the Coming inheritors of the Kingdom. It establishes them in the direct and consoling affirmations of Jesus, that the notice and will of God (Matt. 6 : 25–34, and 10 : 29–31, etc.) extends even to the feeding of the fowls of the air, to the flower withering in the field, to the sparrow falling to the ground, to the numbering of the very hairs of our head, and hence must pre-eminently be exercised toward believers. It makes Acts 17 : 28 a vital reality and unbounded source of trust. It gives force to Jer. 10 : 23; Heb. 12 : 1–15; Ps. 127 : 1, 2; 1 Sam. 25 : 29; Acts 5 : 38, 39, and a multitude of other passages, such as John 7 : 30 and 8 : 20, etc. In the contemplated fulfilment of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants, a *particular* Providence has been extended down to all the believing children of Abraham; in some instances astonishingly

exhibited and in others less marked, but still existing as the divine assurances declare and personal experience confirms. We only add : The relationship that saints now sustatn to Jesus as intended co-rulers in the Coming Kingdom insures from Him a deep and abiding interest in their welfare (even trial and suffering being intended to bring in additional rank and honor), because His own glory and that of His Kingdom is connected with it. The believer feels that the acknowledgment of such a Providence is essential (Isa. 10 : 15), being His workmanship (Eph. 2 : 10 ; Isa. 43 : 21 ; Phil. 2 : 13, etc.), dependent upon Him (1 Cor. 1 : 26–29), vessels of mercy prepared unto glory (Rom. 9 : 23), manifesting the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. 3 : 9–11), and showing forth the praise of His glory (Eph. 1 : 4–12).

PROPOSITION 186. *This doctrine of the Kingdom sustained by the Analogy of Scripture, the Analogy of Faith, and the Analogy of Tradition.*

A doctrine so important and fundamental as this ought to be fully sustained by the analogy of Scripture and faith, and, subordinately to these, by the analogy of tradition. This we *pre-eminently* claim for it.

Archb. Usher, in his advice to young ministers (*Life of Usher*, by Parr, p. 87) says: "Take not hastily up with other men's opinions without due trial; nor vent your own conceits; but compare them first with the analogy of faith and rules of holiness recorded in the Scriptures, which are the proper tests of all opinions and doctrines."

Obs. 1. In relation to the analogy of Scripture, which exhibits a general connection and agreement subsisting between the truths contained in Holy Scripture, such connection and correspondence is strikingly manifested. Thus we have *first* the covenant with its promises; *then* a Theocracy with a special ordering growing out of it; *then* the amplification of this covenant with David, owing to the foreseen fall; *then* the overthrow of the Theocratic Kingdom on account of sinfulness; *then* the prophetic announcements, based on the covenants, of the restoration of this Theocratic Kingdom (under a new arrangement) by David's Son and Lord; *then* the First Advent of the promised Messiah, David's Son, and the tender of this Kingdom on condition of repentance; *then* the rejection of it by the nation and the atoning death of Jesus, with the postponement of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent; *then*, to provide a seed for Abraham, the call of the Jews and Gentiles; the establishment of the Chr. Church; the connection that this Church sustains to the postponed Kingdom; the relation that the Messiah maintains toward it; the assurances that we have in Christ's ability in virtue of His death, resurrection, and exaltation to fulfil the covenanted promises; the fulfilment of covenant and promises at the Sec. Advent; the condition of the Church during this intermediate period, and the attitude of nations during the Times of the Gentiles—are all given, *so unmistakably and connectedly* by the different writers, as to form *a complete chain*, one link firmly fastened to another. *A perfect historical connection* is apparent in the Word, and is repeated in verified history, showing us, if we will accept of it, an agreement of Scripture in affirming God's purpose to raise up *a glorious Theocratic Kingdom*, strengthened by the present abundant provision made through Christ for its consummation. Revelation, in all its varied utterances, *constantly responds* to this Theocratic idea, and upholds the blessed work of Redemption that is to be perfected and realized *in the Theocratic Kingdom*. So naturally does this run through Scripture, that we need not depreciate or set aside any portion of the Word (as e.g. the distinctive preaching of John, Jesus, and the disci-

ples); there is no part of it that we find antagonistic (as e.g. Zech., ch. 14); there are no promises that we need to spiritualize away (as e.g. those to the Jewish nation as such); there is no portion that we must regard with mistrust (as e.g. the Apoc., 2 Pet., etc.); there are no utterances that require toning down (as e.g. in reference to watching for the Advent, etc.); there are no sections of it that we must separate and subdivide in the most arbitrary manner (as e.g. Mill. prophecies in Isa. 25, etc.). Instead of this, one part of Scripture fully sustains another, and combined form *a distinct related series* from which, taken in its plain grammatical sense, we would not remove an iota either by direct denial, or by fastening upon it a sense not grammatically expressed in the words. But having already shown such a connection to exist under our propositions, we only add that this feature is *corroborative of the truthfulness and logical correctness of our position.* If this were lacking—if such a connection were wanting (as e.g. in the announcement of the postponement of the Kingdom)—then a material flaw would be found in our doctrinal teaching, and the Analogy of Scripture (which is the foundation of the Analogy of Faith) would lead to mistrust and doubt, instead of being, as now, confirmatory of faith and strength.

Obs. 2. The Analogy of Faith (closely allied with the preceding) deals more with the connection that one doctrine sustains to another and to the whole system of truth, or to the great end designed in Redemption. While fully agreeing with Martensen (*Ch. Dog.*, p. 42) that the Analogy of Faith, to be duly appreciative and effective, requires "a Christian mind which has come into possession of Christian truth," etc., yet even the historical aspect and connection of doctrine must commend itself to every considerate mind; for if it can be shown that one doctrine *contradicts another*, it does not demand piety or faith to perceive the antagonism. But we justly claim that this doctrine of the Kingdom, instead of being antagonistic to other doctrines of the Bible, confirms, either directly or indirectly, other doctrines, or serves to explain and illustrate them, or exhibits them in their natural connection and proper relations. Take the Kingdom as covenanted and predicted, and it brings into view a large number of indispensable doctrines related to it. Thus e.g. the doctrine of election (Props. 24, 55, etc.), of the engrafting of Gentiles (Props. 61, 62, 63, etc.), of postponement (Props. 66, 67, 87, etc.), of the church (Props. 89–102), of the speedy Advent (Prop. 74, etc.), of the Pre-Mill. Advent (Prop. 121), of a Pre-Mill resurrection (Props. 124–128), of the Judgeship of Christ (Prop. 132), of the Judgment Day (Prop. 133), besides many others, are intimately united with it—in fact, showing how it can be realized, thus evincing *an intimate harmony* existing between them, without violating or contradicting each other in any statement. The doctrine of sin (Prop. 8), the inability of man to secure the forfeited blessings (Prop. 120), the necessity toward fulfilment of Christ's death (Prop. 50, 84, etc.), the Divine Sovereignty, which answers ample realization (Props. 79, 80), and others are maintained in their integrity, while repentance and appropriating faith in Jesus, as the Christ, in order to secure co-heirship with Him in the Kingdom, are strongly enforced. Indeed, the Kingdom being the great *end* designed through which completed redemption is to be attained and manifested in behalf both of the saints (resurrected, translated, and glorified) and the Jewish nation and Gentile nations, it will be seen that the

different doctrines *all sustain*, more or less, *an intimate connection with the same*. As presented in the propositions, there is no conflict between them —one supporting the other—unless we interpret unhistorically, ungrammatically, or one-sidedly. By wresting passages from the dispensation to which they belong and applying them to another ; or, by building upon a single passage and isolated without allowing the general scope or the whole tenor of truth to illustrate and explain ; or, by giving preference to obscure and figurative passages over against covenant and enlarged explanation and promise ; or, by not permitting one doctrine to receive its due enforcement because of its relationship to another ; or, by not considering all the Scripture pertaining to one doctrine and its cohesion with others before advocating it—by these and similar expedients the analogy of faith is *seriously violated*. This might be illustrated by appealing to various doctrines which assume prominence *in their relation* to the Kingdom, but a few only are selected to enforce our meaning. Thus e.g. the doctrine of a peculiar, distinguishing first resurrection is found to be conditioned, not merely by the passages which teach it (Props. 124–128), but by the fact that without it *the Kingdom itself* could not possibly be inherited and established *as covenanted and predicted*. It is *a legitimate outgrowth of covenant promise, of Kingdom prediction*, as well as of promise to individual believers. Then, take the doctrine of the Restoration of the Jews, and we find that it is to be received not merely on account of the prophecies bearing on the subject (Props. 111–114), but because *it necessarily follows from the convenanted, elected position occupied by that nation*. So also the Pre-Mill. Advent of Jesus is grounded in *the Personal relationship* that Jesus bears (Props. 48, 49, 81, 82, 83, etc.) to the Kingdom, and *the impossibility* of fulfilling either covenant or promise without it. Even the injunction to be watching for that Advent receives its consistent and proper significancy in the light of the Kingdom. Thus likewise the Judgeship of Jesus, the Day of Judgment, the world to come, and numerous other doctrines are shown *to be requisite to, and in strictest accord* with, the Kingdom. One of the sweetest consolations that this doctrine of the Kingdom affords, is that it thus supports, strengthens, and elucidates the other doctrines of the Bible, and binds them into *a symmetrical whole*, required to attain to the majestic design held by the Divine Purposes.

Obs. 3. Subordinately, we also introduce the Analogy of Tradition, seeing that some lay so much stress upon tradition, and which, to a certain extent, is reasonable and allowable. Our doctrine of the Kingdom is fully sustained by the Analogy of Tradition, by which we mean that it accurately agrees with the teaching and tradition of the Church in the formation and primitive period (Props. 74, 75, 76, 77, 78). Instead of confining ourselves to the tradition of the third and succeeding centuries (like the Roman Catholics, Puseyites, Mystics, etc.), we go back to the first and second centuries for the doctrine of the Kingdom as held by the Church. This tradition, we claim, justly, ought, so far as this leading doctrine is concerned, to be *the most reliable* because of *its nearness* to the inspired teachers and leaders of the Church. How well this tradition corresponds with the doctrine has been presented in numerous quotations from, and references to, the Apostolic and Primitive Fathers. No other doctrine of the Kingdom than that of this covenanted one, defended in these pages, finds *the least support in, or agreement with, the quite early Church*. This to us is a

source of self-congratulation, seeing that if the doctrine is thus contained in the Bible, and if it was thus proclaimed by inspired men, *then* we ought —if indeed the truth—to find it *distinctively taught and held* by the Church at, and immediately after, the period when she is favored with the teaching and explanations of inspired men. If our doctrine is untrue, *then* the spiritualizing, mystical view of the Kingdom ought to have, at least, been stated and defended by the quite early Fathers. The lack of the latter—postponed to a later period, and then the product of fastening additional senses upon Scripture—is evidence, corroborative, of *the justness* of our position ; and the prevalence of our view is testimony, additional, that we apprehend the doctrines of the Bible on this point just as the Church, favored by personal inspired direction, apprehended them. To weaken the force of this, it must be explained *how* our doctrine should be so universally held without, if erroneous, *a protest* from the apostles and the elders ; and *how* it comes that, in reference to so vital and fundamental a doctrine, *the whole Church*, east and west, north and south, should—if in error—indulge in the hopes excited by a huge mistake, and that it should be left to the emasculated Origen or the Arian Whitby to develop the truth. But this must be done without charging—indirectly at least—inspired men with conniving at error (to prepare men for persecution, etc., as some say) and without tracing the Church through men guilty of error and wide-reaching mistake in the leading, most prominent, theme of the Bible. Our doctrine is the only one that receives this tradition and clears the early Church of the prevailing charge of error, etc., vindicating her veracity, purity, and testimony.

Compare on the Fathers and their use, the articles in the Cyclops., the writings of Daille, Lightfoot, Waterland, Isaac Taylor, Bull, Usher, Andrews, Priestley, Middleton, etc. We cannot receive the Romish or Puseyite view that tradition is of equal authority as a rule of faith and practice with the Scriptures ; for they are simply witnesses of so much truth as they possessed, not being constituted judges or authorities. We cannot, either, as some High-Church parties, elevate them to the position of being such exclusive and proper expositors of Scripture that no views opposed to those expressed by them are to be tolerated ; for this limits religious freedom, opposes a barrier to advancement in knowledge, and places the Fathers in a false position, repudiated by themselves. The prevailing Protestant view, which we uphold, is, that they are to be received as any other theological writers, and that truth, found to be such by a comparison with Scripture, presented by them is to be received with deference. In important and essential doctrines, it is reasonable to expect a presentation, in part or in whole, of the same, evidencing its reception, apprehension, etc. (comp. Props. 9 and 10 for our position in detail.)

Obs. 4. The doctrine of the Kingdom, supported by the analogies of Scripture, faith, and tradition, utterly repudiates the insidious, extreme theory of Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine theologies, the one following the other in course of development. This is advocated in order to strengthen *the departure of more modern thought* from the Primitive Church position. It has *no foundation*, in fact, Scripturally or historically, and is an idea broached by Joachim, in his famous prophecies, making Peter, Paul, and John the representatives of successive periods, and now pressed into service to indicate how, by way of apology for the change, the Church came *to be removed* from the early belief on this and kindred subjects. The diversity and peculiarities arising from style, temperament, etc., *cannot* thus be forced, without injury, into a divinely contemplated succession of Church stages. It is simply a human opinion, without *the least* Scriptural basis, eloquently and even forcibly expressed, and thus the more likely to

mislead. Its leading idea is that the Petrine teaching was more of an accommodation to Jewish thought and forms (as e.g. prevailed in the Primitive Church), while the Pauline and Johannine are better adapted to an advanced stage (as e.g. the modern). On the other hand, the doctrine of the Kingdom insists upon it that the teaching, spirit, comprehension of the truth, etc., of the three, are not only *the same* in reference to the Kingdom, but that they are intended to be *combined* (not to represent successive stages) to bring out peculiar features pertaining to it. The analogies fully confirm this view.

Obs. 5. In view of these analogies confirming the doctrine of the Kingdom, we may well ask whether this mutual relationship of doctrine, gradually bestowed, given by various writers in different ages, and yet evincing an intimate connection, necessary for *a continuous and harmonious Plan*, was merely accidental? Can such a remarkable correspondence, attested to at every step historically, in upholding and developing the establishment of such a Kingdom, be accounted for in any other way than that it is *the Divine Purpose*, as stated in the covenants and prophets, to accomplish it? Against Wünch, Paine, Paalzow, etc., who assert that Jesus was a deceiver, mere enthusiast, we, aside from numerous other reasons to the contrary, find one in *this correspondence* of truth, viz., that David's Son came in accordance to covenant promise, and the reasons why the covenant promises were not realized at the First Advent are prominently given in the New Test., but which such writers *conveniently ignore*, just as if they were not also recorded. Against Bahrdt, Reimarus, etc., who pronounce the Scriptures, the rise of Christianity, the life of Christ, etc., to be attributable to natural causes, we show, from this standpoint, that *the agreement* of one with the other in doctrinal relationship—although separated in the bestowal by centuries, etc.—testifies to *an intelligent Plan* beyond the power of nature or man to devise without the introduction of that which would mar its harmony of inception, unfolding, and execution; seeing that, instead of *one distinctive mind* controlling it, the minds of many would be engaged in its formation and development. Against Kant, Thiess, De Wette, Wegschneider, etc., who make Christianity divine and Jesus a messenger from God (doing good service against ultra-Rationalism), and yet seem inclined to do away with the manifested supernatural and the miraculous, this doctrine of the Kingdom with its related doctrines is so firmly based on *the supernatural*, that if the one is rejected the other falls with it, seeing that the supernatural accompanies it from the beginning to the end, as e.g. in giving of covenants, in establishment of Theocracy, in the birth, etc., of Christ, in the provisions made for accomplishment, etc. The analogies which exist forbid mere abstraction and half-way measures in the reception of the Scriptures; they either contain *a Divine Plan* supported in its Theocratic manifestations and provisions by exhibitions of *the supernatural*, or else they are grossly deceptive in pretensions, etc. Against another class, Döderlein, Morus, Ammon, Bretschneider, etc., who reform the Word to accommodate it to reason; and hence (while professing even that Revelation may contain some things above but not against reason) guage all things pertaining to the future by reason (i.e. by their ideas of fitness, etc.), and make it (i.e. reason) virtually the tribunal before which to judge God's purposes and manner of accomplishing them—this doctrine of the Kingdom with its remarkable correspondences *of necessity, in order to*

secure the Redemption contemplated, must contain things that unaided reason (incapable of devising and executing such a Plan) could neither reveal, and cannot even, when revealed, explain how they are to be accomplished ; as e.g. the person of Christ to constitute Him the covenanted Theocratic King (i.e. God-man), the resurrection, the glorification, the renewal of creation, etc. For what such writers overlook is clearly presented by these analogies, viz., that all such wonderful works, which reason cannot explain, are *legitimate outgrowths from, and conditioned by, the design intended by the Kingdom of God* (which reason itself declares otherwise cannot be realized), and that, if thus performed, will secure the great end contemplated—an end which reason itself not only *commends as desirable and noble, worthy of God,* but the heart longs after.

PROPOSITION 187. *This doctrine of the Kingdom gives coherency to the gospels, and indicates the unity of design in each of them.*

This must follow, provided the doctrine of the Kingdom is as leading and doctrinally fundamental as represented. It has been objected to the gospels that they are greatly composed of detached, fragmentary parts strung together without unity of design, presenting varied, and, in a measure, contradictory, sketches of the life of Jesus. This is effectually disproven by looking at the gospels from the Kingdom standpoint; for then it appears that each writer had *a definite object* in view, viz., to evince unity and a consistent development of Divine Purpose in *a pre-determined Plan corresponding with the covenants and prophecies relating to the Kingdom.*

For the authenticity and credibility of the Gospels, etc., the reader is referred to works specially devoted to the subject, such as Westcott's *His. of the Canon of the New Test.*, Tichendorf's *Where were our Gospels Written?* Sandy's *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, Reuss's *His. of the New Test.*, Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, Davidson's *Introduction to the New Test.*, Stowe's *Books of the Bible*, etc., the general and particular introductions of our leading commentaries, and the articles in our latest biblical dictionaries.

Obs. 1. In order to ascertain the design of the gospels and to comprehend the unity therein, the student must place himself, *not* in the modern position of thought, but in the posture of those *to whom* these gospels were first presented. Then, all who read the Old Test. entertained the Theocratic-Davidic idea of the Messiah and Kingdom; all believed that a descendant of David, specially related (Theocratically) to God, would appear, who would *restore* the throne and Kingdom of David and reign majestically as the prophets predicted. Now, in the very nature of the case, writing for *such* persons who received the covenants and prophecies in their grammatical construction, it was *requisite*, in view of what actually occurred, to show that Jesus was a descendant of David; that He was related to and acknowledged by God; that He was the powerful Messiah; that the Kingdom was tendered to the elect nation; that the nation, through its representative men, rejected the Messiah and Kingdom; that this Messiah, foreseeing His rejection and death, must give assurances indicative of *the postponement* of the Kingdom; and that, notwithstanding His death, *He is able* to re-establish the Kingdom. Now, these are precisely the points that are *fully* presented in the gospels; thus most admirably adapted to meet the objections that in the quite early age would be urged against the claims of Jesus to be "the Christ." If a strictly logical history of Jesus is ever written, it must embrace something like these divisions: (1) The offered Messiah and His claims, how evidenced; (2) the rejected Messiah

and His utterances from the time the representative men conspired to put Him to death; (3) the crucified and resurrected Messiah, showing how covenant and prophecy can still be fulfilled. The great lack in all previous histories has been that the writers have taken too much a *modern standpoint* from which to view Jesus, and have *thus failed* to show the *intimate connection* existing between previously given covenants and predictions and His life. In other words, His life has been too much considered *isolated* from a previously presented Divine Purpose, from covenants understood in their plain, grammatical construction, from a relationship to an elect nation, from a tender of the Kingdom, its rejection and subsequent postponement, and the result has been that, while all these are given by the evangelists as *necessary* to preserve the unity and claims of that life, the omission introduces defects which mar the otherwise *self-evident coherency* of the gospels. The more the gospels are contemplated in the light of the covenants and of the facts as they existed at the First Advent, *the more logically consistent, the more connected and admirably adapted to secure the design intended, will they appear.*

The critical student will observe, what we have abundantly proven, that the doctrine of the Kingdom was promulgated *before* the Gospels and Epistles were written, as evidenced by the general belief, and that the Gospels all take it *for something well understood.* So fundamental is the Messiahship of Jesus and the doctrine of the Kingdom, that, in the very nature of the case, it must have been leading in its doctrinal teaching; and the Gospels and Epistles being *afterward* written—if genuine and apostolical—must not contradict the covenants and predictions but be *in accurate correspondence* with them. In other words, there must be an agreement with the faith that the plain grammatically expressed sense of the Old Test. had led the pious Jews to entertain. This we find, and the fact that it is found evinces both their logical connection with the Old Test., and that they could not possibly have had the late origin assigned to them by some destructive writers. The unity of the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse is observed best by noticing: (1) their connection with the Messianic idea of the Old Test., and (2) the retention of the Christ idea after the First Advent. Numerous and able writers—however they may have handled the subject—have shown, by the repeated references, etc., that the New Test. is based on the Christ-idea contained in the Old. This position cannot be controverted. Now the New Test. first gives the fulfilment of the Scriptures in the Person of Jesus, indicates why He is "the Christ," and proceeds to prove that the crucified Jesus is "the Messiah," because He is raised up, exalted, and will come again. But in all this it retains *the Jewish idea* of "the Messiah," because that one was precisely *the idea that was covenanted and predicted.* From this an important deduction is to be made, viz., that the form in which the New Test. is given, is *designedly the best* in order to retain and develop *with power and consistency the Christ-idea.* (1) The four Gospels are given to show why Jesus, although He died on the cross, is the Messiah; (2) then the Acts are presented to indicate the same feature in connection with the fulfilment of promises relating to the present, and of promises to be realized at the Sec. Advent; (3) then the Epistles are given to confirm and strengthen the belief in the same, and (4) lastly, the Apocalypse to direct the eye of faith to the future Coming of the Christ, His triumphant manifestation of Messiahship, and the great glory that shall follow. We only now refer to the fact, as corroborative, that *no controversy* (see Props. 40, 44, 71, 72, 73) was raised between the early Christians and the Jews respecting the meaning, etc., of the Christ (for the controverted point between them was whether Jesus was the Messiah or not), and that many Jews, even priests, with their intense devotion to the covenanted and predicted Messiah, cordially received Jesus as the same, fully believing that at His Second Coming the postponed Kingdom and glory would be realized. It is painfully sad to find how this simple scripturally-founded belief was soon overwhelmed by a mass of rubbish, which *the wisdom* of the world conceived to be better adapted to subserve the truth and God's praise.

Obs. 2. Briefly consider Matthew's statements to vindicate the claims of *a crucified Jesus to the Messiahship as covenanted.* Matthew in the first

verse recognizes *the covenant relationship* of Jesus in His being "*the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,*" and then follows the recital of His miraculous birth (ch. 1), indicative of this Jesus being *related to the Divine* and of His being *supernaturally endowed*, just as became the "*born King of the Jews*" "that shall rule my people Israel" (ch. 2). The tender of the Kingdom *on condition* of repentance by John the Baptist, the baptism of Jesus, and the assurance given of Divine recognition, are presented (ch. 3). The Kingdom is also thus *conditionally* offered by Jesus and His disciples (chs. 4–10, etc.). The promised Messiah is one who must, in order to fulfil the convenants and promises as given, be able *to exert supernatural power;* and hence this power, as *an earnest*, is exhibited (chs. 8, 9, 10, 11, etc.). The Jews reject Jesus, refusing to repent (ch. 11 : 16–24) ; the truth is known to some (ch. 11 : 25–27) ; the Pharisees find fault with Him, and actually "*held a council against Him, how they might destroy Him*" (ch. 12 : 14), so that He charged those He healed not to make Him known. (And here, foreseeing the result, already intimations are given of the call of the Gentiles, ch. 12 : 17–21.) Then we have repeated condemnations of the wickedness of the Jews (ch. 12), followed by parables illustrative that the Kingdom of heaven *could not be realized until* "*the end of the age*" (ch. 13). Although despised by His own countrymen (ch. 13 : 54–58), yet He vindicates His Messiahship by supernatural power exerted (chs. 14, 15, etc.), by the confession of Peter (ch. 16 : 13–20), by foretelling His own death and resurrection (ch. 16 : 21–24), by the transfiguration (ch. 17 : 1–10), and by specifically predicting His betrayal (ch. 17 : 22, 23). After the presentation of various teachings, exhortations, and commands (chs. 18, 19, 20), Jesus, to bring the matter of His Messiahship to a public test, and to leave the Jews inexcusable, makes His public entry into Jerusalem (ch. 21 : 1–14), which the representative men (chief priests and scribes), although enforced by the exercise of miraculous power in the temple itself, *refuse to accept* (ch. 21 : 15). This led to a collision between Jesus and the chief priests and elders (ch. 21 : 23, etc.), in which the latter question Christ's authority, and are silenced by the reply of Jesus. The crisis is then nigh at hand, for He tells them (ch. 21 : 28–46) that they were *unrepentant*, and that the Kingdom so graciously offered to them, and in which they enjoyed *a covenanted right*, should be *taken from them* and given to others. Jesus speaks even more plainly (chs. 22 and 23), culminating in expressly predicting that *the desolate Davidic house*, the tabernacle in ruins, should *remain thus until* His Second Coming ; that (ch. 24) the city and temple would be overthrown and the nation be smitten and in tribulation down *until the Second Advent ;* and that at His Coming again as the King (ch. 25) the righteous should inherit the promised Kingdom. Finally comes the recital of the last tragedy—the betrayal, trial, sufferings, death and burial, with incidents connected therewith (chs 27 and 28)—followed, however, by a single fact, briefly stated, sufficiently comprehensive in itself to vindicate the ability of Jesus Christ to fulfil the covenants at His Second Advent, viz., His resurrection. Matthew's Gospel is thus exhibited as *a strictly consecutive, logical array of facts to establish the Messiahship of Jesus* over against objectors who would allege the non-fulfilment of the convenanted promises in that no Kingdom, *such as covenanted*, was then established. The reasons for such non-establishment are *pointedly given, the postponement is specifically stated*, the time *when* it shall be restored (at Sec. Advent) is clearly presented, and *then*, as a climax,

to assure us of the certainty of such fulfilment, the resurrection of the crucified Jesus is affirmed. Matthew, as well as the other evangelists, takes it *for granted* that the reader of the Gospel is *previously well posted in covenant and prophecy*, and hence writes for such persons. Therefore, a simple statement of *facts*, as they occurred, is *all* that is required to lead *a believer* in covenant and prophecy to acknowledge Jesus as "*the Christ*," who will *yet fulfil* them, as claimed, at His Second Coming. This was the universal belief of those Christians who first received and perpetuated the Gospel, thus verifying, in the reception of it, our doctrinal position.

Gregory (*Four Gospels*, p. 125) and others are correct when they make "the Messiah," and that Jesus is the Messiah, "the central idea of Matthew's Gospel," but Gregory (p. 126) falls into a great error, when he declares that Matthew was appointed "to correct the false Jewish notions, at that day so prevalent, concerning the Kingdom of the Messiah," and adds: "He accordingly exhibits the Kingdom not as a temporal one, like the Roman Empire, but as *Theocratic*, or as a spiritual reign of God Himself, in the Person of the Messiah, *in the hearts of men*" (chs. 5 : 3–12, and 12 : 1–50, etc.)." Let the reader look at the proof alleged, and see how the preparation *for* the Kingdom is converted *into* a Kingdom. He can find *not a particle of proof* in Matthew to sustain his position, or his notion of what composes a Theocracy. So Ebrard (*Gospel History*, p. 68) goes beyond the recorded facts when he says that Matthew's Gospel was designed to furnish proof "that in this capacity (viz., Messianic) Jesus *had founded a Kingdom*, not circumscribed by the contracted forms of the ancient Theocracy, but a Kingdom of faith and of the Spirit, comprehending all nations, and fulfilling the promise given to Abraham." (Comp. for answer e.g. Props. 67, 69, 70, etc.) A thousand such statements, which have *no foundation* in anything that Matthew writes, pass current, at present, as if they were axiomatic truths.

Obs. 3. Mark's Gospel follows precisely the same method. In the first verse *the Theocratic relationship* of Jesus is presented in the words: "*Jesus Christ, the Son of God*," the Kingdom is offered *conditionally*, upon repentance (ch. 1), the Messiahship is indicated by His baptism and works, so that He is "*the Holy One of God*" (ch. 1 and 2). But the Pharisees (ch. 3 : 6) conspire "*how they may destroy* Him," and the Scribes reject (ch. 3 : 22) Him. After instruction, works, etc. (chs. 4, 5, 6, 7), which show forth the wisdom, power, and treatment of Jesus, we come to plainer statements based upon His rejection by the Jews (ch. 8), to which are appended the confession of Peter, the prediction of His death and resurrection, and the transfiguration (ch. 9). Instead of a Messianic Kingdom, He again foretells (ch. 9 : 30, 31) His death and resurrection (ch. 10 : 32–34), and, after sundry exhortations, we are brought to His public entry into Jerusalem (ch. 11), which so inflamed "*the scribes and chief priests*" that they "*sought how they might destroy Him.*" The efforts of His enemies to entangle Him, and how they were silenced are given (chs. 11 and 12). Instead of the setting up the expected Messianic Kingdom, comes the foretelling (ch. 13) of the destruction of the temple and a long-continued calamity down *to the Second Advent.* Then we have the details of the betrayal and death (chs. 14, 15), ending with the resurrection (ch. 16), which insures the continued Messiahship of Jesus and His ability, *at the appointed time*, to fulfil all that is written.

We cannot receive Gregory's (*Four Gospels*, p. 161) ingenious "Key to Mark's Gospel," viz., that the Gospel is for the Roman, and hence Jesus is presented "from the Roman side or point of view, as answering to the idea of divine power, work, law, conquest, and universal sway." (Neither can we accept of his "Keys" to the other Gospels.) Gregory, as fundamental to his theory, assumes, without determinate proof, that Jesus is already exercising the power, etc., of the covenanted King, whereas He is rep-

resented as Coming in humiliation, suffering, and being a rejected, crucified Redeemer. The Gospels alike are designed for all men, for they in a similar manner tell the story of the crucified one, that He is the Messiah, that He tendered the Kingdom on condition of national repentance, that He was rejected, etc. One enters into more details than the others, or presents facts that the others omit, or gives a different arrangement. Much that is written on the peculiarities of these Gospels as to personal peculiarities, style, etc., we may accept ; much, however, we can only accept in a relative, and not absolute, sense ; much we must reject being founded exclusively on modern notions, the development and Church-Kingdom theory.

Obs. 4. Luke, writing at the time he did, must also follow the same course, viz., to meet the objections that might be alleged against *a crucified Messiah* and *the non-appearance* of the Messianic Kingdom. In the first and second chapters he shows, by the birth and office of John, and by the birth and announcements respecting Jesus, that He is the *destined Theocratic King*, who, while son of David, is also (v. 32, 33) "*the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His Father David. And He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His Kingdom there shall be no end*—" and this, too, is done in view of (v. 72 and 73) "*His holy covenant,*" etc. Having thus exhibited in the introduction *full faith* in the covenants, and that Jesus was the One *through whom* they were to be realized, he now proceeds in a narrative which shows *why they were not then fulfilled, and why we should continue to exercise faith in Jesus that they will yet be verified.* He gives us John preaching the Kingdom *conditioned* on repentance, John's testimony to Jesus, the baptism and genealogy of Jesus (ch. 3), the preaching of Christ and how He was treated, the works of Christ and how He was recognized as "*the Holy One of God,*" as "*Christ, the Son of God*"(ch. 4). The supernatural power, etc. of Jesus is presented (ch. 5), and yet the scribes and Pharisees are angered (ch. 6 : 11) against Him, so that both John and He are *rejected* by them (ch. 7 : 30–35). Yet He continues to exhibit the Messianic attributes (ch. 8), how Christ sends forth the twelve to preach a Kingdom *conditioned* by repentance, brings forth the confession of Peter, describes the foretelling of Jesus' death and resurrection, the transfiguration, etc. (ch. 9). He gives us the particulars of the sending forth and the preaching of the seventy, which is also a tender of the Kingdom of God upon the repentance of the nation (ch. 10), but comparatively *few*, and those "*babes,*" accept of the truth, for *the mass* are unrepentant (ch. 11 : 14–32), being "*an evil generation*" (also vs. 42–54). The position of the representative men of the nation calls forth severe rebukes (ch. 12), mingled with intimations that the rewards and the Kingdom itself are to be received and enjoyed *at another, still future Advent* of the Son of Man, for which Coming believers are exhorted to watch. Such intimations finally culminate in *a direct assertion of the postponement* of the Kingdom until, and the restoration of the desolate Davidic house at, the Second Advent (ch. 13 : 35). The inexcusableness of the Jews in rejecting Him is illustrated (chs. 14, 15, 16), and in consequence *the postponement* of the Kingdom until Sec. Coming enforced (ch. 17 : 20–37). (See Prop. 110.) Again Jesus foretells His death and resurrection (ch. 18 : 31–34), makes His public entry into Jerusalem (ch. 19), which so excites "the chief priests and the scribes and the chief of the people" that they "*sought to destroy Him.*" The triumph of Jesus over His enemies when they dispute His authority is stated (ch. 20) ; the destruction of the temple and the calamities connected with

it, and extending during the times of the Gentiles down to the Sec. Advent, are foretold (ch. 21) ; the duty of watchfulness is enjoined (ch. 21) ; and then (chs. 22, 23, 24) comes the history of betrayal, suffering, death, burial, resurrection and ascension. Luke adds, what the other two Gospels take for granted (ch. 24 : 44–53), that the wonderful exhibition of the Messiah confirmed the faith of the disciples in believing, that this crucified but resurrected Jesus was indeed *the Messiah,* in and through whom the Scriptures would be fulfilled.

We cannot possibly receive Gregory's (*Four Gospels*, p. 215) "Key to Luke's Gospel," based on the alleged supposition that the same was written for the Greek, for the Greek not being interested in the Messianic idea, Luke presents "the perfect man to meet the Greek ideal," etc. It is amazing, after Luke's *testimony to the Messianic idea* and the fact that the proper conception of the same is just of as fundamental importance to the Greek as to Jew or Roman, that such unfounded statements can be penned. Much of such misleading learned assertion is circulated and retailed from the pulpit and press. We select Gregory because, being a valuable work in many respects, it is so often quoted as authority.

Obs. 5. Now we come to John's Gospel, which the Tübingen school (recently reiterated in *Supernatural Religion*, etc.) declares cannot be reconciled with the other Gospels, inasmuch as it describes a different personage, etc. Let us follow John's portraiture of Jesus—keeping in view *John's idea of the convenanted Kingdom*—and it is a sufficient answer to all such criticism to show that John treads *precisely* the same path gone over by the other Gospels, in answering the objections that might be brought against the Messiahship of Jesus on the ground of His crucifixion and the non-establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. The substantial agreement of the Gospels is readily seen by also rapidly passing over John's Gospel ; for, while John adds particulars that the others omit, he *fully incorporates* their statements and presents *the identical* line of defence. In the opening chapter *the great Theocratic element* at once appears, viz., that the Messiah, who is to reign as predicted, is *God ruling in* and *through David's Son ;* and therefore while He is "*Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph,*" He is also "*the Son of God,*" the destined "*King of Israel.*" Miraculous power, divine attributes are ascribed to Him, thus holding Him forth, as in the other Gospels, to be *the very Messiah* who is *able to fulfil* the prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom. Mattthew, Mark, Luke, and John, in the conferring of supernatural power, which embraces the same ability to perform all things, hold forth Jesus as *the predicted One*, who, as David's Son, is *higher* than the kings of the earth, the promised *Theocratic King.* Even the rejection of Him by the Jews (v. 11), the calling of the Gentiles intimated (v. 12), His manifestation to Israel (v. 31) because the elect nation, the ascription of the removal of all evil from the world (v. 29), which He will yet perform, the supernatural still future to be exhibited (v. 51), etc., all assume a *deeper significancy* if we place ourselves in John's position when he wrote, viz., regarding, owing to the sinfulness of the Jewish nation, *the Kingdom as postponed to the Sec. Advent.* and now endeavoring to hold forth the characteristics, sayings, etc., in Jesus which should inspire confidence in *the hope that at the Second Coming this Theocratic King will restore the Davidic throne and Kingdom.* The proper humanity (ch. 2) is acknowledged, and the mere mention of the mother and brethren of Jesus, as of something well known, is indicative of an early narrative ; while the power of working miracles, the manifestation of authority in the temple,

the prediction of His own death and resurrection, and His refusal to commit Himself to the Jews, show that allied with Him is *more* than mere humanity. Next comes the discourse with Nicodemus, which, appealing to him as "a master in Israel" (i.e. one who ought to be conversant with the covenants and their requirements), who ought to know what the promises of God demanded, evinces that the Kingdom, the Theocratic arrangement, as described by the prophets, cannot be set up without provision made for its inheritors, both to purify them and to raise them up from the dead. The careful student will notice that John, in the *very beginning* of his Gospel, proclaims *the rejection* of Jesus by the Jews (so ch. 1 : 5, 11, ch. 2 : 24), and now again (ch. 3 : 19) repeats it, while holding Him up as the appointed Saviour, and declaring that even His death (already predicted, ch. 2 : 21, 22) was an appointed means (e.g. through the resurrection, etc.) to save the world. In ch. 4, after the prediction of His death (based upon His rejection by the nation), he tells the Samaritan woman that "salvation is of the Jews" (see Prop. 68), and yet, in view of the contemplated engrafting of others, gives encouragement and reception to the Samaritans, who acknowledge Him as "*the Christ.*" Hence the Gospel of John exhibits one trait differing from the preceding gospels (and yet also mentioned by them) which gives it a remarkable complexion, viz., *it commences at once with His rejection* and death, *with the implied postponement* of the Kingdom, and call of the Gentiles. What the other evangelists only mention *after* a regular series of introductory statements, John specifies at once *as something well understood* in his day. Here we find the *true logical* attachment of John's Gospel *with* the others, and the perfect harmony existing between them becomes apparent. This is the more distinctive as we proceed to point out the more salient connections following. After showing (ch. 5) how salvation was offered to the Jews (an offer confirmed by the manifestation of supernatural power), and how they, instead of accepting, "*persecute Jesus and sought to slay Him,*" he refers again to the sublime Theocratic relationship which Jesus *justly* claimed, and *links its manifestation with the period of the resurrection and the judgeship of the Son;* thus agreeing with the other gospels which also claim that Jesus is the Messiah, but *postpone* His covenanted reign to the Sec. Advent. This is repeated (ch. 6), and causes many to take offence because they could not understand how the sacrifice of Himself was necessary to make Him the immortal Son of David and to give Him the power to raise up His own at the last day. The constant allusion to death and the end of the age implies *as a consequence the postponement* of the Kingdom. The Jews (ch. 7 : 19, 25) desire *to kill Him*, notwithstanding His doctrine and works, and make the attempt to take Him (v. 30, 45), which influences Jesus to again predict His death and the gracious results flowing from it. In the conflict with the Jews (ch. 8), the Saviour justifies His claims to their acceptance, declares His death through their instrumentality, shows that His death, instead of extinguishing or diminishing His Messiahship, only *perfects* the same, and that they "*seek to kill*" *Him*, which is evidence that they are not of faith as Abraham was, and that they shall experience death. The controversy between Jesus and the Jews continues (ch. 9), for after Jesus hid Himself to escape the stones (ch. 8 : 59) they designed to cast at Him, He again appears in His mission of mercy and love, healing the man born blind, which excites still more the animosity of His enemies. Jesus again (ch. 10) proclaims His Coming death (through

which, however, being perfected as the Redeemer, ultimate salvation is attained), appeals to His works to sustain His oneness (Theocratic relationship as covenanted) with the Father, and "*the Jews took up stones again to stone Him.*" The reader will please notice that in this chapter Jesus, in explanation of the declaration, "*I and my Father are One,*" declares it an equivalent to (vs. 36, 38) "*I am the Son of God,*" "*the Father in Me and I in Him,*" and this corresponds with the covenanted language that David's Son was *also* to be God's Son, in whom the Theocracy is to be *evermore* established, and with the language of the other gospels, which in miraculous birth, baptism of Holy Ghost, supernatural power exerted, and the use of the phrase "*the Son of God*" (as Matt. 4 : 3 ; 8 : 29 ; 14 : 33 ; 27 : 43, 54 ; Mark 1 : 1 ; 3 : 11 ; 5 : 7 ; 15 : 39 ; Luke 1 : 35 ; 4 : 41 ; 8 : 28 ; 22 : 70), are in *perfect agreement* respecting *the Person* of the Messiah. The enmity of the Jews increases in consequence of the raising of Lazarus from the dead (ch. 11), which culminates in the holding of a council by the chief priests and Pharisees, in which it is *fully determined* to put Jesus to death (vs. 47–53). This death foreshown (ch. 12), is followed by the public entry into Jerusalem the foretelling of His death and resurrection, and the continued disbelief of the Jews. Then comes the prediction of His betrayal (ch. 13), Peter's denial, His coming death, with several discourses (chs. 14, 15, 16, 17) designed to comfort and sustain His disciples in the coming trial. The betrayal, trial, sufferings, death, burial, are given, crowned by the resurrection (chs. 18, 19, 20, 21), which "*are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in His name.*" Thus the objections that could be urged against *Jesus crucified* are fully met and answered ; seeing that *the Messiahship* of Jesus is manifested by His life, works, death, and resurrection, and that *the postponement* of the Kingdom is shown to result from the impenitence, unbelief and hostility of the Jewish nation.[1] It is remarkable that, taking John's Gospel connectedly, it enters more fully into a detailed account of *the enmity* of the Jews toward Christ, its manifestation and result thus *powerfully corroborating* the preceding gospels in their more briefly given accounts of the same, and thus presenting on all sides strong points of *logical* attachment. The design John had in view, necessarily introduced new material, as e.g. facts which excited such hatred, the conduct of Jesus while thus exposed, and the encouragements and promises given to His disciples while thus persecuted. The *true key* to the proper comprehension of John's Gospel is to notice the first point of contact between it and the previously given Gospels, viz., that the God-given Divine Messiah was *rejected* by His own elect nation, and consequently the implication (afterward enforced) that the blessings of the Messianic Kingdom (as covenanted and predicted) *are delayed until* He is again manifested at "the last day."[2]

[1] The critical student will also see that this peculiarity of John's Gospel gives us *the proper key* to harmonize the Apoc. with the Gospel. The Gospel refers to the First Advent, the Apoc. to the Second Advent ; the one is a proof of the Messiahship of Jesus and gives the reason for the postponement of the Kingdom ; the other presents us with what this Messiah will do when the period of postponement is ended, etc. In addition, the whole truth only becomes apparent when we regard the meaning attached to "the Christ" by the quite early believers. This is noticed under several Propositions, especially Prop. 205.

[2] A few remarks concerning the method and spirit instanced by destructive criticism in reference to the Gospels, may be in place. Various critics assign the composition of the Gospels, in the form now received, to the later portion of the second and beginning of

the third century. In this way an alleged proof against inspiration is derived, by making the Gospels "unhistorical." But in this discussion, as conducted by them, three things are noticeable: (1) That although the historical question of the Gospel is of immense value, seeing how deeply it affects the interests and hopes of multitudes, yet so little regard have such writers for the interests and feelings of their fellow men, that they only produce the class of evidence which they deem *favorable to themselves*, and carefully ignore another class which is *against their theory*. Where is the writer among them who has noticed what Norton, Tischendorf, and a host of writers show respecting the general reception of the Gospels in the early part of the second century? Who has e.g. invalidated the testimony of Celsus (Origen C. Celsum, p. 77), who mentions them as existing under various collections in his time? The simple fact that they are unwilling to bring forward *all* the evidence; that they exclude it, leaving their readers in ignorance of it just as if it did not exist, lowers their honesty as critics and evidences *a pre-determined* design. Yet such men gain the ear and the minds of multitudes. (2) The disagreement among themselves, so that e.g. one will reject all the Gospels, and another (like Renan, *Life of Christ*, p. 33, *The Anti-Christ*, p. 33) will admit the apostolic authority of several portions of the same, and even of John's Gospel; one will make them as early as possible owing to "Jewish conceptions," and another as late as practicable on account of "doctrinal development," etc. Every conceivable and antagonistic theory is presented in order to depreciate them. (3) They do not allow the testimony of the Fathers, being in conformity with the Gospel, to speak; i.e. they do not, as Christian Apologists, present the evidence on either side and from these draw conclusions, but withdrawing the testimony given depreciate the Fathers as witnesses and as unworthy of credence. Hence they who live at present are more worthy of belief than those who lived the nearest to the time the records were given. These features sufficiently indicate the intent and spirit actuating their authors. Out of numerous illustrations we present the following: Fiske (*The Unseen World*, ch. on "The Jesus of History"—a one-sided eulogy of Strauss, Bauer, Renan, etc., which defeats itself by its extravagance) endeavors to make out that John's Gospel was written long after John because Anti-Millenarian and Anti-Pauline. Thus e.g. he makes (p. 79) this unsupported statement, given as proof: "It cannot for a moment be supposed that such a book, making such claims, could have gained currency during John's lifetime without calling forth his indignant protest. For, in reality, no book in the New Test. collection would so completely have shocked the prejudices of the Johannine party. John's own views are well known to us from the Apocalypse. John was the most enthusiastic of Millenarians, and the most narrow and rigid of Judaizers. In his antagonism to the Pauline innovations he went farther than Peter himself. Intense hatred of Paul and his followers appears in several passages of the Apocalypse, where they are stigmatized as 'Nicolaitans,' 'deceivers of the people,' 'those who say they are Apostles and are not,' 'eaters of meat offered to idols,' 'fornicators,' 'pretended Jews,' 'liars,' 'synagogue of Satan,' etc. (ch. 2). On the other hand, the fourth Gospel contains *nothing Millenarian or Judaical;* it carries Pauline universalism to a far greater extent than Paul himself ventured to carry it, even condemning the Jews as children of darkness, and by implication contrasting them unfavorably with the Gentiles; and it contains a theory of the nature of Jesus which the Ebionitish Christians, to whom John belonged, rejected to the last." To this crowd of misstatements it may very briefly be said: (1) That it is strange that men at so late a day should find this bitter hostility and antagonism between the Apostles, of which the early Church in all its extent *knew nothing;* (2) that if the Gospel is so intensely opposed to Millenarianism, how it comes that *all the early Millenarian Fathers* received it just as they did the others; (3) that a large unbelieving party do find in John's Gospel such a Judaizing particularism (as e.g. "Salvation is of the Jews," etc.) that they reject it on this account; (4) that it is remakable that the correspondence between the Apocalypse and the Gospel (respecting the divinity, etc.), pointed out in the various works on the subject, should *be totally ignored* as if they did not exist; (5) that the testimony of the Fathers is laid aside and the modern conclusions (pre-judged) of unbelief are coolly substituted; (6) that the statements of our leading Church historians, Neander, Mosheim, Giessler, Kurtz, etc., respecting Ebionism and John's relation to it, should be set aside without confirmatory proof; (7) that the agreement of John and Paul *on all essentials* should be deliberately contradicted; (8) that *the correspondence* between Paul and John in locating the Kingdom and Millennial glory at the Sec. Advent is flatly contradicted by mere assertion. The fact is, that Fiske exhibits his want of knowledge respecting the Millenarian doctrine. Paul and John were both Millenarian, and in the design of the Gospel, as presented by us, the Millenarian tendency is constantly exhibited, and the unity with the entire New Test. is pre-

served in showing *the postponement* to the Second Coming of the re-establishment of the Kingdom, etc. As this has been specially pointed out in detail, it is noticeable that Fiske's assertions are *without the slightest foundation*, historically and scripturally.

Obs. 6. Our position is abundantly confirmed by the succeeding Acts. The line of argument in preceding propositions so fully portrays this that a few remarks need only be appended. In all that was afterward recorded, *the same class* of objections are answered in *the same manner*, viz., *the Messiahship of a crucified Jesus* is affirmed, and is mainly supported by His resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven ;[1] and at the same time the unbelief of the Jewish nation, the rejection of Christ by it, the call and engrafting of Gentiles, the fighting, mixed condition of the Church down to the Sec. Advent, and the postponement of the Kingdom of God (until a people are gathered out) down to the Second Coming of this same Jesus, is *directly declared*, and each statement directs the eye of the believer onward to that joyful period still future, when "*the blessed hope*" shall be realized. Such a view binds the contents of both Old and New Tests. into *a unity*, which no other can present, and evidences *the pre-eminent logical position* occupied by the first churches of believers in "*the gospel of the Kingdom.*" Such a view indeed leaves *much for faith*, seeing that it places much in the future ; but our position ought to be that *of faith*, not blind, unreasoning faith, but *of faith* suggested and sustained by *the accumulated evidences* of the Messiahship of Jesus.[2]

[1] Keeping before us the design of the Gospels, it is essential that each one should specify the resurrection of Jesus, for that is *the culminating fact* which makes *the Messianic fulfilment possible.* Hence the inconsistency of those (e.g. Schleiermacher) who refuse to regard it as a doctrine *relating* to the person of the Messiah, and Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 1, p. 142) aptly quotes Riggenbach as saying : "I cannot understand how any one can assert, 'I believe in the resurrection of Jesus,' and then explain this belief as a matter of *secondary* consideration." The Gospels are framed to show that *a crucified Jesus is the Messiah*, and this is also the design of Acts (in which the resurrection is specially repeated twenty-four times), and the resurrection of Jesus is regarded as amply sufficient to vindicate the same. The acknowledgment of Paul to *the Christship* of Jesus was founded on the revelation of this crucified Jesus, etc.

[2] The reader has seen what a powerful use we make of such passages in Acts : Ch. 1 : 3, 6, 7, 8 ; ch. 2 : 24-36 ; ch. 3 : 19-26 ; ch. 7 : 5 ; ch. 13 : 23, 34, 46 ; ch. 15 : 13-18 ; ch. 26 : 6, 7 ; ch. 28 : 20, 23, etc. And our usage of the same is abundantly fortified (1) by the grammatical sense of the covenants and prophecies ; (2) by the sense attributed to the same by the pious Jews, and (3) by the early expressed faith of the believers brought to acknowledge Jesus by the Apostles, evangelists, and their immediate successors. Our position is an impregnable one.

Obs. 7. The critical reader will observe that our argument respecting the Gospels brings forth new and additional reasons why the Gospels could not have been written at as late a period as some destructive critics assume. The *very form* in which the Gospels are given indicates an early origin ; for *the design* manifested in answering certain objections shows that it meets *the only objections* that were current *immediately after* the death of Jesus and opposed to His claims *of Messiahship*. Had they been written later, the writers could not have placed themselves in complete sympathy *with* the early age (first century), but would undoubtedly have incorporated *later objections* and the then existing style of thought. The simple form of ending each Gospel with the resurrection of Jesus, the omission of any detailed statement of the call of the Gentiles, the points of contact with the Jewish position, the firm and unwavering conformation *with* covenant and

prophecy, are all opposed to the notion of a later origin, seeing that the inevitable tendency of enlargement, apology, change, reflections, etc., from the more modern standpoint (already feeling the effects of an incorporated philosophy and division of sentiment, etc.) would have been, more or less, made manifest.

Against the theory of Strauss and all others springing from unbelief, it is amply sufficient to say that Jews wedded to the plain grammatical sense of covenant and prophecy, who believed in the grand fulfilment of these under the Messiah, could not possibly have brought themselves to present such a history of the Messiah as we find recorded in the four Gospels—a rejected, crucified Messiah. But carefully look at the Gospels from *the Jewish standpoint* just mentioned, and the solution is found in *the fact* that the Gospels are an apology for and defence of the crucified One, and *the key of reconciliation* is given in the expressed faith that this identical Jesus, crucified, dead, buried, resurrected, and ascended to heaven, *will again come, and then restore, in great power and glory, "the fallen down tabernacle of David."* This gives us the proper clew to their form, their early production, their Jewish-Christian origin, their method of vindicating the Messianic idea related to Jesus. It evidences the correctness of Renan (*Origin of the Gospels*) when he is forced to admit, over against the Strauss school and other objectors (advocating a late origin), that the composition of the Gospels took place between the years A.D. 60 and 80. The manner of narration, method, etc., clearly evidence the truthfulness of such concessions from unbelief, over against the mere assertions (in which some professed believers, as Giles in *Hebrew and Christian Records*, join) of infidelity.

Obs. 8. Thus comprehended, the Gospels answer the question, which unbelief has never yet been able to meet, how it comes *that Jews*, looking for a Messiah, as described by covenant and prophecy exalted to the restored throne and Kingdom of David, *should accept of a crucified Jesus as such a Messiah.* The replies usually given in answer do not fully meet the conditions of the expectant Jews. The secret for such an acceptance lies in the fact that *every* inspired teacher took the position that both covenant and prophecy would be fulfilled *by this same Jesus at His Second Advent*, and that His claims to the Messiahship were so sustained by His birth, life, death, and resurrection that we could have *the strongest assurance*—in a thus far fulfilled Word of God—that that which has been *postponed will inevitably be realized.*

The same explains also the reason *why* the late Gospel (John's) should lay more stress on the Divinity of Jesus ; *why* Jews, inheriting the grand idea of Monotheism, should ascribe divinity to "the Christ ;" *why* the narrators so artlessly relate how His own mother did not fully recognize His calling, how His disciples were rebuked, how they denied Christ in time of trial, and exhibited incredulity respecting His resurrection, etc. —all of which is *not* in the line of imposture, but comes forth as *a natural result* of covenanted position and circumstances. The phenomenon of "resemblance in the Gospels," the subject of much inquiry and controversy is explained, as we have seen, by the design of the writers, viz., to teach that the crucified One is "the Christ," and the filling up of the details is indicative of the conversion of the Apostles to a decided and firm faith in the same. Various reasons are given respecting there being *four* Gospels, such as to make the testimony abundant, to make them supplementary one to the other, to make them correspondent (so Allegorists) with Ezekiel's man, lion, ox, and eagle, etc. Gregory in "Why Four Gospels?" has the idea that Matthew wrote for the Jews, Mark for the Romans, Luke for the Greeks, and John for the Church at large. This is non-essential, and Gregory's view is hardly sustained from the fact that all have the same design, and wrote for the Church in common.

Obs. 9. This view of the design of the Gospels shows how unfounded is the assertion of Schleiermacher and others, that it is impossible to prove that Jesus is the Messiah from the prophecies. The defence of the Mes-

siahship of Jesus in the Gospels is based upon two facts, constantly appealed to, viz., that Jesus in His manifestation, etc., *fulfilled the prophets*, and that by a certain determinate fulfilment He gives us sufficient evidence that *the remainder will be fulfilled* at the period of time designated. And such proof ought really to be stronger to-day, since reason can add to the Gospels *a continuous fulfilment* only announced in them, as e.g. the dispersion of the Jewish nation, the treading down of Jerusalem, the Gentile domination, the gathering out of believers, the mixed and struggling condition of the church, etc. We are even in a better position, owing to over eighteen hundred years' continuous fulfilment, than the Apostles were, *to test* the truthfulness of the Messiahship of Jesus. For, we accept not merely the fulfilled prophecies in the life, etc., of Jesus pointed out by Himself (as e.g. John 13 : 19, etc.), or by the Evangelists (as e.g. John 19 : 35, 36) as pledges of His Messianic character, but in addition to these, eighteen centuries *confirm such pledges* by an uninterrupted verification of leading and most important statements.

PROP. 188. *This doctrine indicates the unity of the Epistles.*

They all agree (1) in expressing faith and hope in the covenants and prophecies; (2) in Jesus as the Messiah; (3) in a complete fulfilment of both covenant and prophecy at the Sec. Advent; (4) in locating the covenanted Messianic Kingdom in the future at the Sec. Coming of Jesus; (5) and in urging all to accept Jesus as the promised Messiah, so that they may become qualified to enter into His coming Kingdom.

Obs. 1. Let us take Romans and see how it corresponds with a plain grammatical interpretation of covenant and prophecy. Paul asserts, ch. 1 : 3, 4, that Jesus was "*made of the seed of David, according to the flesh,*" and His power as Son of God "*by the resurrection from the dead;*" that, chs. 1, 2, 3, salvation is obtained by faith, "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile," for all have sinned and all need salvation; that all that believe shall attain unto it, provided their faith is provocative of good works, Jesus being purposely raised up for our justification. That, ch. 4, we are justified by faith like unto Abraham and become his children so that with Abraham—who is "*the heir of the world*"—we inherit the covenanted promises, being "*heirs*" with him; and reference is made to the resurrection for its fulfilment in the words "who quickeneth the dead." That, ch. 5, being thus "justified" and at "peace" with God through Jesus, we "*rejoice in hope of the glory of God,*" to be realized through grace in Jesus by the bestowal of "*eternal life,*" which enables us to experience the fulfilment of promise. We, ch. 6, should, therefore, not live in sin or serve sin, but in holiness and newness of life, so as to obtain through Jesus "*the end everlasting life.*" We, ch. 7, obtain deliverance from sin and its legal results through "Jesus Christ our Lord." Being thus, ch. 8, believing, justified, and holy, we shall experience a glorious resurrection and exaltation, because reckoned as *joint-heirs with Christ* (and inheriting with Jesus, implies that we participate with Him in His covenanted Theocratic inheritance), when *creation* itself shall share in deliverance from the curse; and for *such glorification and inheritance* we have the strongest possible assurances in the love of God in Christ Jesus. He shows, ch. 9, his interest in the Jews, the call of the Gentiles, and argues that those who are *heirs* with Jesus are *the children of promise;* the faithful among the natural descendants of Abraham, and the faithful among the engrafted Gentiles, for so God had predetermined it in mercy. He follows, chs. 10 and 11, with answering the question, Who shall be saved? by declaring both Jew and Gentile through faith in Jesus the Christ; and then points out *the fall* of the Jews, their *restoration* at the Coming of Jesus, etc. (which we have already used, as indispensably necessary in order to verify covenant promises). Then come, chs. 12, 13, 14,

15, 16, practical directions, interspersed with declarations concerning *the nearness* of the day of salvation, the *power* of Jesus to save, the *ability* to perform the promises made to the fathers, etc. All is confirmatory of our position, for the hope is decisively expressed that *at the Sec. Advent* of this Messiah *all* the promises of God, given in covenant and prophecy, shall be abundantly verified in fulfilment. If any truth is uttered by Paul with distinctness it is this: that David's Son now removed *will return again*, and that at this return of the Messiah (through whom we can now entertain *the hope* of salvation) the faithful *will inherit* with Him, *a resurrection* taking place, *a deliverance* of the creature occurring, *a certain complement* of Gentiles being gathered, *a restoration* of the Jews from their fallen condition being experienced *because the Deliverer comes.*

Again we protest against the arbitrary assumption put forth with much learning that we have a Pauline, Petrine, and Johannine theology and Eschatology, one following the other in the course of development; the Petrine being reckoned the lowest (most Jewish). Such a distinction exists only *in imagination*, and not in fact, and is introduced by some as an apology for their divergence from, and antagonism to, the early Church belief. Whatever distinctive peculiarities exist in Peter, Paul, and John (as to style, method, manner of presenting subject, etc.), they are *a unit* in presenting *the same faith and hope.* This we unmistakably show by our quotations from them. No deserved eulogy of Paul can detract from Peter's accurate knowledge of the Kingdom, etc., seeing that to him, first of all, was given the keys. No praise of John's loving disposition can lessen Paul's, evidenced by his abundant labors, etc. It is unjust to these ancient worthies to suggest a diversity of belief, where none exists, and then manifest amazement when unbelief seizes such suggestions and presses them to an extreme. Blinded by the rejection of the plain grammatical sense of covenant and prophecy, prejudiced against the simple biblical faith of the early Church, and prejudged under the influence of a favorite development theory, one or the other is "too Jewish" and must give place to "a higher spiritual development" found in this or that writer. The fundamental idea of the Kingdom proves that they *are in unison.*

Obs. 2. With this accord all the Pauline Epistles. In 1 Corinthians he makes *the return* of this Messiah to fulfil the promises exceedingly prominent, speaks of the still future "*day of our Lord Jesus Christ*," urges to preparation for it that we may be rewarded, declares that we shall *then* "inherit the Kingdom of God," exalts *the judgeship* of the saints in that day, and shows how it is introduced by *a resurrection* of the righteous, fulfilling Millennial predictions. In 2 Corinthians precisely *the same strain* is kept up respecting the future "day of the Lord Jesus," the then fulfilment of God's promises, the resurrection introductory to that day, the glory to be revealed, all of which should influence us to faith and holiness. Galatians, as we have shown, is pre-eminently in advocacy of our doctrine, seeing what stress it lays on *the continuance* of the covenant and its *realization* at the Sec. Advent, when we "inherit the Kingdom of God." In Ephesians he refers to the coming "dispensation" in which the Messiah, when He returns, shall "*gather together all things*," and we shall obtain an inheritance in "*the world to come*," so that in the ages to come He may show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Jesus, the Christ; we then being in "*the commonwealth of Israel*" (adopted even now) and experiencing the blessings of "*the day of Redemption*," having "*inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God.*" In Philippians the future "day of Jesus Christ" is prominently set forth, the *distinctive* resurrection of the righteous is presented, and the looking for this Saviour, who comes again to subdue all things unto Himself and give

glory, as "*at hand*" is expressed. So likewise in Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, etc., we have a necessary preparation for inheriting the Kingdom to be revealed at the Sec. Coming of this Messiah Jesus; a hope that *then* the covenanted promises will be fulfilled; a waiting for His Son from heaven in order to inherit the promises; the resurrection of the just at that Coming and the glory that follows; a looking for that "day of the Lord;" the loving of His appearing and constituting it "*the blessed hope*" in view of its results. In brief, every Epistle that Paul wrote is *in perfect agreement* with our doctrinal position.

It has been objected that the New Test. writers never contemplated the bringing together of their writings into its present canonical form; that this was done by fallible men, and that the New Test. never received, as a collection, the approval that the Old Test. did from Jesus and inspired men. To all this the reply is ample: The Old Test. contains the covenants and predictions, each writing of the canon corresponds with these, and hence under the Christian consciousness that these were supplemental (showing how they are realized, etc.) the canon arose; the force of the relationship is self-evident; the authorship is vindicated by the unity; and the divine blessing following their reception is corroborative of their value and authority.

Obs. 3. The Epistle to the Hebrews being specially singled out by some as hostile to our doctrine, it deserves separate notice. The writer is largely employed in proving that Jesus is the Messiah, that His death was necessary, that the atonement by Him is valid, and that the condition of faith in Him is a requisite for forgiveness of sin and divine acceptance. But in various ways he shows his correspondence in doctrine: in "*the world to come;*" the salvation linked *with the Sec. Advent;* the Jewish view of *the Rest,* and its reference to the Sec. Coming: a High-Priest *for the ages;* the certainty that *the Abrahamic covenant* will be fulfilled: the qualifications of Jesus in virtue of His work and endless life *to verify* the promises of God; the "*looking for Him to appear the second time without sin unto salvation;*" the certainty that His enemies shall *all* be overcome; the "*seeing the day approaching;*" the "*yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry;*" the positive declaration that the ancient worthies "died in faith, *not having received the promises,* being strangers and pilgrims," and expecting their inheritance promised to them through the Messiah; the "*better resurrection;*" the promises received by them and us at the same time; the continuing city to come; the firstborn; the everlasting covenant; the future shaking of heaven and earth; and "a Kingdom which cannot be moved." Such statements clearly evidence the author as *in perfect accord* with our position.

This Epistle has been attributed to Paul, Barnabas, Clement, Luke, Mark, Aquila, Silas, and Apollos (the last being a favorite with many, e.g. Bleek, Alford, Pressense, Kendrick; while Paul is upheld by numerous writers), and the author cannot be dogmatically asserted. We are not concerned respecting the author, for its reception into the canon, the early use made of it, and, especially, its perfect agreement with all other portions of the Word, commend it as worthy of due acceptation. Efforts have been made to make it stand in opposition to Paul and consequently unauthoritative, as by Schultz and others. Thus e.g. Schultz and Reuss (Lange's *Com. on Hebrews,* and Introd. by Moll.) maintain that its Christology has a "decidedly spiritualistic tendency whereby obscurity is thrown upon Christ's connection with humanity." But aside from the direct refutation found in ch. 2 : 14–17; 7 : 14; 10 : 12, and 12 : 3–4, etc., it must not be overlooked that this Epistle was specially addressed to Jews to whom the Messianic connection with David was familiar, but who, not knowing God's Plan in fulfilling the covenants and predictions relating to David's Son and Lord, were apt to stumble over the *crucified* One and the attributes ascribed to Him. Hence the line of reasoning *adapted* to

meet the objections and knowledge of the readers. The Gospels, the preaching, the general faith had already manifested Jesus as David's Son (which is stated when, ch. 7 : 14, "it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah"), and now is shown how Jesus, once a dead, crucified Messiah, could fulfil the covenants. Therefore we have these points clearly made manifest : (1) The necessity and reasons assigned for that death ; (2) the fact pointed out that it renewed and confirmed the covenant ; (3) the acceptance of His sacrifice and exaltation qualified Him to fulfil all covenanted and predicted promises ; (4) that He will come again and bring the salvation thus promised ; (5) that owing to the union of the divine and human in Him, being thus greater than man, we can have every confidence in His ability and power, (6) and that by receiving this Jesus, trusting in Him, living a life of practical faith in Him, we shall enjoy the blessings at His return. The Epistle is thoroughly Messianic, showing how and wherefore the Messiah suffered, how and when the Messiah will come again, etc., and His connection with humanity is clearly pointed out as to His person ("*the seed of Abraham*"), and as to His present and future relations. So decisive is this that some, running to the opposite extreme, object to the Epistle as being "intensely Jewish" in its complexion. Another thing is obvious, viz., that its teaching is in complete accord with the Pauline spirit and theology.

Obs. 4. James preserves the unity of teaching, for he makes us gathered out to be "*a kind of firstfruits of His creatures*" and "*heirs of the Kingdom which He has promised*" (by covenant and prophet and Saviour). In his short Epistle he prominently sets before us "the last days" and "the coming of the Lord as drawing nigh." The entire tenor and spirit of his brief letter is to exhort believers, by practical deductions, so to live that when the Messiah Jesus returns again they may be rewarded in His, then, established Kingdom, obtaining "a crown of life."

The student well knows how James has been treated by able men (e.g. by Luther, called "a straw-epistle" when compared with others, so Pref. to Edition of the N. Test., 1524). Various writers, unable to reconcile the doctrine of justification by faith and the judgment according to works, have taken a similar unjust view. A recent one, Ströbel (Lange's *Com., James*, Pref., p. 23), declares : "No matter in what sense we take the Epistle of James, it is always in conflict with the remaining parts of Holy Writ." Unbelief (as in the Tübingen school) gladly accepts of such an opinion as an acceptable weapon against the canon. Many receive him very coolly, as e.g. illustrated in Hase (*His. Ch. Church*, p. 25), who says that James was "the principal leader of the Christian Jews," and then adds : "To judge from the Epistle bearing his name, he must have been a pious and earnest teacher, especially in his admonitions in favor of morality, but with no prominent characteristics *peculiar to Christianity.*" It is prejudice, a pre-judging, that prevents a calm survey of the doctrines held by the Apostles, that can deliberately thus lower the claims of James. Because Paul e.g. insists upon justification by faith (Rom. 3 : 28 and 4 : 1, etc.—and such a justification James allows, ch. 2 : 1, 5, 23, etc.) and James upon justification by works (ch. 2 : 14-26, which justification Paul also allows, as e.g. in making the faith he advocates productive of works which graduate our reward or loss), it is concluded that an antagonism exists between them. Now, aside from the union of vital faith with works, and godly works with living faith (which forms *the bond of unity* between James and Paul), it is sufficient to say that if we properly discriminate between the justification of believers (a judicial act at the outset of a Christian career) by faith in Jesus, and the judgment of believers at the Sec. Advent (which was prominent with James) according to their works (also taught by Jesus, Paul, and the other Apostles) we have *a perfect agreement* between them ; because the latter's justification is measured by the works, and if works are altogether lacking there will be not merely loss, as Paul taught, but far more as James teaches, a dead faith which neither justifies in the sense of present divine acceptance nor in the sense of an ultimate rewarding. Dead and fruitless it cannot justify ; living and active, the justification, present and future, is evidenced by works ; this Jesus taught, this Paul and all the Apostles taught, and this James likewise teaches. The writer sees no valid reason whatever for rejecting any of the writings contained in the canon. Aside from the historical and critical evidence given in their behalf by various able works and commentaries, they are all in such strict accord with the rest of the Word, so confirmatory of the Divine Record, that they cannot be displaced without undue violence. Hence we cordially receive James, Hebrews, 2 Peter,

etc., feeling that they corroborate the covenants and predictions containing the Divine Purpose and the great central Theocratic idea. Besides, He who overruled the bestowal and preservation of the Scriptures would not have permitted them to become the generally recognized part of divine revelation for man's guidance unless they were given under His auspices, and calculated to confirm the truth.

Obs. 5. Peter is full of our doctrine, as is readily seen in his "*reserved inheritance*" and "*salvation ready to be revealed in the last time ;*" in his "praise, and honor, and glory at *the appearing* of Jesus Christ," and "the grace that is to be brought unto us *at the revelation* of Jesus Christ ;" in his "strangers and pilgrims" and "chosen generation, royal priesthood, holy nation, and peculiar people ;" in his exhortations to piety and endurance so "that, when His glory *shall be revealed*, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy," being "partakers of the glory that *shall be revealed ;*" in his injunctions to humble ourselves "that He may exalt us in due time ;" or in the solemn motive presented : "But the end of all things *is at hand ;* be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer." Or (as in the Sec. Epistle), in the "exceeding great and precious promises" to be realized in Jesus at *His return*, "for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into *the everlasting Kingdom* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ;" in "the sure word of prophecy," "the last days," "the thousand years as one day," "the day of the Lord," "*the looking for and hasting unto* the coming of the day of the Lord," and, "looking for, according to promise, new heavens and new earth in which dwelleth righteousness." All this indicates the faith that actuated him—a faith grounded in the Messianic idea as contained in covenants and prophecy.

Obs. 6. Lastly is John, who presses upon us personal religion, so that we may "abide in Him : that *when He shall appear*, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed *at His Coming.*" The Second Advent with its resultant blessings is prominent before him, and he urges withdrawal from the love of the world and its lusts in order that we may experience the happiness and glorification that shall *then* be revealed. He warns of "the last time," of "antichrists," and insists upon our perfecting our love so that "we may have boldness in the day of judgment," receive "eternal life," and obtain "a full reward." The present, in his estimation, is simply a preparatory period, designed to qualify us for the Messiah's return, when the glorious promises of God will be realized.

Thus we find a remarkable unity respecting the doctrine of the Kingdom. No one teaches the prevailing modern theories respecting the Kingdom of God ; none of the meanings usually assigned are to be found. It would be a fatal flaw to the inspiration of any one if we e.g. found a direct application, as now so confidently made by many, of Daniel's fifth Kingdom to the existing Church ; it would be *a violation* of covenant and prophecy. But such antagonism exists only in writings outside of the Scriptures. The faith of all, the hope of all, points to the Second Coming of Jesus *when* He shall return to re-establish *the covenanted and predicted Theocratic Kingdom*, in which glorious salvation is to be realized. A sufficiency is given, with marked distinctness, to teach this, and inspire us with like faith and hope. In reference to Jude's Epistle, it is sufficient to say that, owing to his decided testimony to our position respecting the personal Advent, condition of the dispensation and last times, some reject his testimony as "too Jewish." With many his declarations have but little weight. Even Smith's *Dic. of the Bible*, art. "Jude," says : "The Epistle of Jude is too unimportant to be a forgery ; few portions of Scripture, with reverence be it spoken, could have been more easily spared." We thankfully accept of Jude as one of the decided witnesses of the truth, evidencing the general agreement.

PROPOSITION 189. *It is only through this doctrine of the Kingdom that the Apocalypse can or will be understood and consistently interpreted.*

The reason for this lies in the simple fact that it announces the Coming and the events connected with the Advent of the Theocratic King. Now to enter fully into its spirit and appreciate its force, to form an adequate conception of the testimony of Jesus either as a whole or in its several aspects, there must of necessity be a *previous* acquaintance with the covenants and a correct *apprehension* of the burden of prophecy based on those covenants, resolving itself into the promised Kingdom.

Obs. 1. The *Theocratic idea,* in the very nature of the case, must ever be kept in view, for with it the Apocalypse *begins and ends.* It *begins* with announcing His Future Advent, and delineates His Theocratical character as "*the Prince of the kings of the earth.*" and "*the Alpha and Omega,*" etc., and *ends* with the Theocratical rule *inaugurated* here on earth. The Kingdom being *the goal* of prophecy, it is reasonable to expect that the very last predictions would largely enter into the subject, and in such a manner as to show how the older prophecies will be ultimately fulfilled. To understand such fulfilment, however, it is requisite to carefully notice the prophecies *previously* given by the same Spirit, and which, without undue repetition (it being taken for granted that the reader knows them because they embrace "the Hope"), may be partially incorporated by quotations, etc. With a knowledge of the covenants and prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom, the student is placed in the only position suitable to the contemplation and study of a book, which largely deals in *a restored Theocracy,* as is clearly evidenced not only by the Advent of David's Son, but by the corresponding adoption of older Theocratic predictions, and enforcing them by identifying and linking them with such an Advent.

This position enables the student to appreciate the grandeur of the Person who gives testimony of coming events to John, to notice His distinctive Theocratic relationship, and to observe His continued determination to perfect the work of redemption. This alone will reconcile, as fitting, just, and glorious, the revealed purposes and actions presented in the Apoc., connected with previous revelation—introducing a restitution predicted, an administration covenanted, a blessedness and glory faintly foreshadowed and described, a perfection and vastness of redemption formerly implied in the Divine Purpose and in the Person of the Redeemer. The reason why Luther expressed himself so slightingly respecting the Apoc. arose, as various writers have remarked, from his limited idea of the Kingdom. Thus e.g. Olshausen (Gen. Introd. *Com.,* ch. 10) says: "This (Apoc.) was obscure to him from the fact that he could not thoroughly apprehend the doctrine of God's Kingdom upon earth, which is exhibited in Revelation, and forms the proper centre of everything contained in it." Luther, in his views of the Kingdom, was too much under the influence of the Augustinian teaching, and he allowed doctrinal considerations (as in the rejection of James's "strawy" Epistle) to unduly influence him in

criticism—always a dangerous and one-sided procedure. We may add : the authenticity and credibility of the Apocalypse is the most powerfully sustained of any of the Scriptures, being fully indorsed by the earliest Fathers, by the Alexandrian fathers (who were Anti-Millenarian), and by the admissions of the ablest critics of the destructive school. (Comp. the introductions of commentaries generally and works specially devoted to evidences, as e.g. Alford, Stuart, Lange, etc. ; Wordsworth on the *Apoc.*, Elliott's *Horæ Apoc.*, etc., and arts. on the Apoc. in Herzog's *Encyclop.*, M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.* etc.) From these and others we learn the historical fact that some, who could not enter into the spirit and end designed by the Apoc. (viz., too Millenarian and Jewish), doubted its genuineness and authority, but that no book of the New Test. is so fully proven to be genuine as this one ; so much so that unbelievers of the schools of Bauer, Strauss, Schwegler, etc. (whatever motives may actuate them), stamp its genuineness as simply incontrovertible.

Obs. 2. It has been the custom of some to write of the book as if it were to be estimated *isolated* from all others, standing or falling on its own merits. This involves a grave mistake, and overlooks both the Divine Plan in Redemption continuously unfolded, and that a Revelation pertaining at all to such a Plan must be in full accord with previously given ones. Owing to this oversight some excellent writers, as even Barnes, Stuart, etc., have made sad work with various portions, not willing to concede, e.g. that Millennial descriptions in *precisely similar* language with *precisely similar* acts, blessings, etc., are *identical* with those uttered by older prophets. Others again, like Reuss, Desprez, etc., entirely ignoring the covenanted Kingdom and finding in it much that favors "Jewish conceptions," pronounce it a sort of "*Judæo-Christian*" publication, very artistically put together, but unworthy of credence. Of course, with their ideas of the Kingdom of God and of what must constitute the proprieties in its establishment, the Apocalypse is already prejudged. No book, having such a weight of evidence for its retention in the Canon, has been so strangely handled. Rejected or doubted by Caius and Dionysius, on the ground of its interpretation indorsing our view of the Kingdom, it has remained for modern writers to revive the old rejection precisely for the same reason. The view entertained concerning the Kingdom will *inevitably* largely influence our interpretation of it ; and the proper conception of the Kingdom must be entertained before the book can be *consistently* examined, seeing that if a Kingdom has been covenanted, predicted, preached, made the subject matter of previous Revelation, *nothing in conflict* with such a Kingdom can or will be found in a later one. To decide, however, that no real conflict exists, the student must be *sure* that he has the idea of the Kingdom *as expressly given* in Scripture. It certainly is unscholarly to doubt and reject a book on premises that themselves remain unproven ; and yet this is precisely the position occupied by a host of writers. They either reject the book or else ignore and explain away its teachings, because they are "*too Jewish*," without attempting to show that this Jewish form is *not taught* in the other Scriptures, or that their *own view* is contained in previous Revelation. And such is the perversity and antagonism of human deductions from mere reason, that what is "too Jewish" for some is not sufficiently "Jewish" for others ; and the latter is, therefore, made an excuse for discarding it. But such forget, what we have already intimated, that if there are some omissions in making out all the links of a connected chain in the Divine Order, these missing links are found *farther back*, for the book must be viewed in the light of *its connection* with other Scripture. Thus to illustrate : it is objected that in the re-establishment of the Theoc-

racy the restoration of the Jewish nation forms an important feature, and yet this is not stated in specific terms in the Apocalypse. To this we reply that a specific mention is *unnecessary* because numerous other predictions are *already* given and those in the Apoc. are *inseparably joined with them* by incorporating features contained also in them and requisite for fulfilling them, thus forming *a bond of identity and union.* When express promises taken directly from Old Test. predictions relating to Jewish restoration are adopted and assigned to a certain time and order for realization, surely there is nothing inconsistent to hold that such portions *are indicative of a fulfilment of a whole,* seeing that in the Old Test. they are thus related. The Old and the New Test. must be considered as indicated in Prop. 16. But there is a stronger reason why no specific mention is necessary, which does honor to the Spirit which gave the book, and which forms an indirect but most powerful argument in favor of its inspiration. An impostor would undoubtedly have followed in imitating the precise track and language of the former prophets and thus have introduced Jewish restoration as these objectors urge, and to have stated when it is to transpire. This the Spirit could not do, not only because He was describing a transition state in which Gentiles are a large party, but because He takes it for granted, what we have abundantly shown under Election and engrafting into the elect nation, that He is all the time speaking *of the Jewish nation and its restoration.* The Spirit *only* recognizes Jews as the ones that are participants in the Kingdom established. Gentiles to inherit with the Jews must be *adopted, engrafted,* and *as such* form part (Props. 61–63) of the elect nation. Hence, the Spirit rightfully and with *remarkable consistency* virtually describes Jewish restoration when it portrays the establishment of the glorious Theocracy, and the ancient saints with all engrafted ones participating in it.[1] The righteous dead of the elect nation—no others are mentioned—with the living translated form already with Christ the King such a mighty Jewish restoration that the lesser one, i.e. of the nation in the flesh, follows as a matter of course. When the entire seed of Abraham, either natural or grafted in worthily, triumph in a Theocracy, it is on the already granted basis that it is *a Jewish victory* which includes the lesser. Certainly the Jewish King and Jewish rulers of a professedly Jewish kingdom, when such a kingdom is said to be ruled over by them, is amply sufficient to remove the objection. This necessary assumption is sustained by the direct and indirect references (Obs. following), and there can be no misconception of the matter to him who notices: (1) that the saints here exalted to Theocratic positions are really and truly a portion of the Jewish nation; (2) that the very formation and representation of a restored Theocracy in which they alone figure as associates with the King necessarily implies that the rest will follow as given in other places; (3) that the prophecy is given to show how and under what circumstances the Mighty King comes and introduces the promised Theocracy; and as it only relates in its beginning to that Jewish portion of the nation, the elect, to whom the Kingdom is specially given (as stated by Jesus Himself), it fills out a part of prophecy not before given in detail, and teaches us how the prediction of the Saviour relating to the inheriting of the Kingdom (which materially differs from the remaining restoration), is verified; (4) that the Spirit, accepting of the principle of engrafting, and recognizing every believer as a member of *the Jewish commonwealth,* cannot make *any distinction* between Jews and those grafted in, as e.g. He did not do in the

prophecies of Daniel which, notwithstanding the future adoption of Gentiles, speaks of the nation as *a continuous elect one*, all believers in it being saints.[2]

[1] This is so clearly intimated by the general analogy of Scripture that we have excellent writers falling into an opposite extreme, viz., that no other restoration of the Jews but those resurrected and translated ones is to be expected. (See e.g. art. 1, *Proph. Times*, Nov., 1874, and also Waggoner and *others*.) But aside from the answers that we have given under other Propositions, it is sufficient, once for all, to say that this makes *an imperfect* redemption, for one of the forfeited blessings, viz., the perpetuation of the race in a state of innocence, cannot possibly be carried out without such a restoration embracing also blessings to Gentile nations, to creation, etc.

[2] The student also will notice that a direct amplified description of the restoration of the nation is purposely avoided because it would *unnecessarily* provoke the jealousy and persecution of the Roman power. A sufficiency for faith and hope is given, provided the believer receives the Bible *as a whole*. One distinctive feature is constantly taken for granted, viz., that the reader of this book receives as preparatory, in their plain grammatical sense, the everlasting covenants, Abrahamic and Davidic. Coming thus, the student readily sees how the oath-bound promises of God are verified in the statements of the Apoc. Strauss says, respecting the Apoc., that it "gives us a melancholy impression of the imperfect way in which Christ was understood by His most intimate disciple;" but the Book forms a perfect supplement (as we have shown) to His teaching, showing how and when the postponed Kingdom shall be manifested, and the promises of God be realized in all their fulness.

Obs. 3. Keeping in view the distinguishing feature, grounded in the Election and Covenants, that Jews are denoted when the saints are mentioned, we find much incidently expressed confirmatory of this position. Let the reader place himself in the position of *the early believers* to whom the book was given, holding firmly to the hope of a restored Theocratic rule under David's Son at His Second Coming, and he will find *abundant material* for encouraging such a hope. The very *titles of the Coming One* were understood to relate to the Theocratic King, being previously thus used; "*the first begotten of the dead*" and other characteristics of Jesus were regarded as prerequisites for such a reign; the *power* described, adequate to remove death, was essential to the fulfilment of the covenanted promises, as anticipated; the continued designation of "*Son of Man*," "*the root and offspring of David*," as required; the *restitution* presented through Him, as predicted by the prophets; the *power* over all enemies and *the same* given to those associated with the King, as promised; the *relationship* to the promised Theocratic rule impressively given in His having "*the key of David*," and in His being "*the Lion of the tribe of Judah*," hence the covenanted King and Deliverer; the exaltation, ascriptions of praise, the saints waiting for deliverance, the judgments on nations, the wrath of the Son of Man, the harvest and vintage, the first resurrection, the rewarding of the dead, the Sovereignty given to and exercised by the Messiah, the universality of rule, the new heavens and earth incorporating Mill. descriptions, the order announced agreeing with ancient prophets, *all this* coincided with and fostered the notion of *a still future coming covenanted Kingdom*. The significant and special mention, according with Election, of "*the tribes of the children of Israel*," showing that according to the Spirit the saints are regarded (whether Jews or engrafted Jews) *the elect seed of Abraham, the holy elect Jewish nation*. The division of these into "*twelve tribes*" when obtaining "*salvation*," indicating the revival of the Theocratic order; this, in connection with other allusions, is *amply*

GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

sufficient to prove "*the Jewish cast*" of the incoming Theocracy and its *identity* with the One predicted by former prophets.

The Origenistic method of interpretation, the Church's connection with the state, the dogmatism of synods, the writings of spiritualistic and mystical interpreters, the deductions of a destructive and unbelieving criticism, a fettered system of Eschatology, prevented this connection from being seen and appreciated. The Church-Kingdom theory, with unlimited development, darkened the doctrine of election, the engrafting of Gentiles, the nature of the Messianic Kingdom, etc., and hence arose the varied and conflicting views respecting this Book.

Obs. 4. Hence it followed that all the early Christians had no difficulty in embracing the Apocalypse as *a Divine Revelation*, seeing that it both accorded with the previously given predictions of God, and that, owing to the postponement of the Kingdom and withdrawal for a time of the King, it filled up *a void* by detailing His Coming again and the measures that would be taken in effecting the restored Theocracy. Taken *in connection* with the covenants and prophecies, as further explanatory of the mode of ultimate realization, the Apocalypse is most admirably constructed to establish *a firm faith* in the Kingdom we have delineated. This is seen in the early Church and Fathers, who understood and interpreted it thus, and that its first opponents knew not (until Origen devised the remedy) how to refute it without denying the authority of the book itself. Owing to the feeling, that it *necessarily* taught our view, it narrowly, as various writers have observed, escaped (although more canonical as to authority than many others) proscription. To-day it is unjustly rejected by a large number because of its assigned "*Judæo-Christian Eschatology.*" A Kingdom awaiting the Coming of David's Son; preceded by a first resurrection; introduced as, and containing what, the older prophets declared; incorporating a tribal division; holding forth a glorious reign here on earth, etc., all this corresponds too accurately with "*Jewish conceptions*" to suit the taste of those who are anxious to rid themselves of everything distinctively "Jewish." Let unbelief take such a position; but faith, supported by the general analogy and unity of Revelation, *joyfully* seizes upon the book as explanatory of the manner in which the Millennial predictions are to be fulfilled *in this Coming One, and in His most blessed Theocratic rule.*

Hence it follows that the only class of interpreters that deserve consideration, is that one which makes the Advent and Kingdom still future. More than this: which makes the Advent a personal one, the resurrection literal, the Kingdom a covenanted and predicted Theocratic-Davidic restored (the only one covenanted and predicted), and a Millennial glory that fulfils the prophets.

Obs. 5. The objection of Schott and others, that this reign of Jesus is too much in the Apocalypse made out to be a reign of *the Son of David* (Prop. 53, Obs. 9), is found to be *a decided proof* of its inspiration. How else, taking *the covenants and the promises* based on them, could this reign be represented? If the Kingdom, as we have proven, is the restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom in and through David's Son, *then*, indeed, the phraseology objected to is entirely in place and expressive of the fact. The trouble with many writers is simply this: the manner in which this Kingdom is introduced and the Kingdom itself is presented, does *not fit in with their development theory*, being too much indebted to supernatural power and indicating a too close relationship to a restored Theocracy, and

hence it is coolly set aside or spiritualized. Even eminent men under the influence of this theory, not knowing what to do with it, or how to engraft it into their system, deliberately turn away from it (see e.g. Neander, *His. and Plant. C. Church*, vol. 1, p. 396–97). This evinces the influence of *preconceived* opinions respecting the Kingdom, and as a test is *unfairly* applied to the Apocalypse, being precisely in the line of those produced by unbelief. To invalidate the reliability of the Apocalypse in this direction, it must *first* be shown that the Kingdom it delineates is one *in opposition or antagonism* to the Kingdom *expressly covenanted*, once existing but overthrown and predicted in numerous prophecies to be restored. Such a mode of procedure would be logical, and, if consistently carried out, will most certainly lead to a hearty reception of early Church doctrine on the subject.

We have only e.g. to refer to Rev. 20 : 1–6, and see the interpretations given to the first resurrection and the Millennial reign, and how these are applied without any reference whatever to the demands of the covenants (Abrahamic and Davidic), and to the general analogy of the Word concerning the same, and we must conclude that many (as Hengstenberg, Davidson, etc.) interpret with a mind fully biassed in favor of an already existing Messianic Kingdom, and, therefore, strive to make all bend to the support of such a theory.

Obs. 6. This feature of a connection existing between the Apoc. and the prophets, forming *a unity of Divine Purpose*, is alone sufficient to set aside the expositions of that class who make the Apoc. fulfilled in the past, either in the events preceding, allied with, and immediately following, the destruction of Jerusalem, or even extending down and embracing the conversion of Constantine, etc. Such interpretation can only succeed by arbitrary handling, by a violation of unity, and by a total misconception of the nature of Christ's Kingdom. Allowing inchoate force in the historical (Bh. Newton, Elliott, etc.) interpretation, making a fulfilment continuous from the first century down to the Sec. Advent ; admitting pertinence to the suggestions (Dr. Arnold, etc.) that the historical is an imperfect, typical fulfilment foreshadowing another and higher still future ; considering that there is also propriety, etc., in interpreting (as Dr. Seiss, etc.) the whole as still future, we are not now concerned with these several modes of interpretation, only as they severally bring out *distinctively the Theocratic relationship* that the Apoc. contains in common with previously given prophecies. That system which does this the most *effectively* is the *most worthy* of our reception ; that which ignores this the most, is the most unreliable.

Compare e.g. the different systems of Apoc. interpretation as given in the Preface to Lange's *Com.* on the Apoc., in Davidson's Introd. to the New Test., etc., or to our history of the doctrine, or to such a Proposition as 158, and it becomes painfully evident that a total misconception of the Messianic covenants and Kingdom illy qualified many to write on the subject. The Theocratic idea, as a bond of union, and the previously given prophecies, as a basis for amplification, are not noted.

Obs. 7. Whatever advances have been made in interpreting the Apoc., and whatever valuable additions have been presented by various writers, especially recent, a full, complete, and satisfactory exposition of the Book is something that is still lacking. Not one—however valuable—but bears grave defects.

The expositions of a *Preterite* class, such as Grotius, Hammond, Wetstein, Eichhorn,

Ewald, De Wette, Lücke, Stuart, Bush, Lee, and others, are so palpably *one-sided and unjust* to the Apoc., that they have but a small following. The extravagances of some of this class (as e.g. in making the Apoc. a drama with its acts, descriptive of the spiritual victory of Christianity over Judaism and Paganism), are self-refuting. Take the expositions of the *Continuist* class, such as those given by Mede, Bengel, Woodhouse, Barnes, Cunningham, Birks, Brightman, Lord, Elliott, and many others, and it will be found impossible, provided due allowance is made for the prophetic language used, to reconcile their continuation of fulfilment (in seals, trumpets, and vials) *with the facts* stated by prophecy and given in history. Thus e.g. if we examine Elliott, perhaps the best and most profound of this party, we find his order of fulfilment utterly untenable (although plausibly and forcibly expressed). As an illustration—which will apply to a large number of similar works—he applies the sixth seal to the downfall of Paganism and the adoption of Christianity by Constantine and the Empire. But when we look at the prophecy of the seal, it contains "*the great day of His wrath*," "*the face of Him that sitteth on the throne*," *and* "*the wrath of the Lamb*." It contains the *identical* things which are found in Matt. 24 : 29, 30 ; Isa. 24 : 23 ; Joel chs. 2 and 3 ; Isa. ch. 2 ; Zeph. 3 : 8–17 ; Luke 21 : 26, 27 ; Dan. 7 : 9–13 ; Rev. 19 : 15–17 ; Isa. 24 : 21, etc. To refer its fulfilment to the overthrow of Paganism is simply to misapply language which the Spirit has, in other places, *directly applied* to the Sec. Advent of Jesus and the terrible overthrow of His enemies at that time. Some realizing the tremendous force of the prophetic language under the sixth seal, and feeling that nothing has ever yet occurred in history at all commensurate with it, adopt (as e.g. Alford, Isaac Williams, Victorinus, Primasius ; comp. Fausset's Introd. to *Com. Rev.*) a parallel connection of the seals, trumpets, and vials, moving side by side, the second and third series filling up details, etc., and thus the last seal, trumpet, and vial have a simultaneous ending. But this scheme has precisely a similar difficulty in respect to the vials. It is evident and conclusive that the vials which contain "*the seven last plagues*," *follow after* the deliverance of the martyrs and victors over the culminated Antichrist (Rev. 15 : 2-4). They pertain *to the period of vintage*, and are poured out (ch. 16 : 2) on the adherents of the last Antichrist. *Nothing has yet taken place* in the slightest degree commensurate with the prediction. Now any interpretation and application which violates the order laid down, and fritters away the meaning of prophecy, must be discarded as *untenable*. We cannot, therefore, accept of a past and present continuous fulfilment of the seals, trumpets, and vials, or of a dislocation of their order (as e.g. by Barbour in *Three Worlds*, who has the trumpets fulfilled and the seals and vials still future ; or by Ralston *On the Apoc.*, who arbitrarily places four of the trumpets in the Millennial era, and has the vials outpoured before the action of the trumpets) in a partial fulfilment. The diversity and antagonism of all such schemes are great, as e.g. illustrated by the first seal ; one (as Elliott, etc.) insists that it refers to the Roman Empire ; another (as Lord, etc.) to the Christian Church ; one (as Brightman, etc.) to truth ; another (as Mede, etc.) to the Son of God ; one (as Woodhouse, etc.) to ecclesiastical affairs, another (as Barnes, etc.) to secular ; one (as Ralston, etc.) to the Papacy ; another (as Baldwin) to union of the Church and State ; another (as Craven) to science, etc. As we proceed the diversity increases. We may dismiss a multitude of such interpretations by simply keeping in view a few fundamental points. Some schemes are so palpably absurd, and others so shocking to propriety, that it seems strange that they should ever have been published. Take e.g. Hengstenberg's theory, which culminates in making the battle of ch. 19 to denote the Christianization of the Germans (!), the Millennium being past (!), and Satan after his binding (!) now being liberated. Or, take Baldwin's view, which evidences its spirit by making the woman with twelve stars and her man-child to be the Church and the United States (!), the war of Michael to be the overthrow of monarchies by the United States (!), the Son of Man and the Coming as a thief to be applied to the United States (! !), the Advent of the King of kings is that of the United States (! ! !), which shuts up monarchy in the wilds of Asia for a thousand years, introducing a Millennium of democracy (!). So the shallow ravings of Davis, who e.g. makes the wilderness America, the Man-child Jesus, who will be born again by a natural birth (!), who is already come (!), and will lead the American Republic to a great victory over the nations of Europe ; Kossuth being "the angel ascending from the East, and having the seal of the living God." It appears almost incredible, that these and similar works appear, and so basely prostitute this Book, and pervert its sublime predictions, to eulogize and exalt Republicanism. Another class are so completely opposed to the nature and intention of the Book, and to its representations of "the Christ," that a refutation is not required, as e.g. in Gascoyne's *New Solution of the Contemporaneous Symbols of the Rev. of St. John.* A writer defeats himself when, as this one,

he requires us to believe that the magnificent and consoling representations of chs. 4 and 5 are portrayals of an apostatizing from the truth ; that the elders, living creatures, etc., symbolize apostatizing men and civil rulers on earth ; that the grand worship depicted pictures an idolatrous worship ; that the sealed book and the taking of it is indicative of " high pretensions to divine authority in the Church," and that " the Lamb" Himself denotes " the positive idolatry set up in the Church during the fourth century," or " the worship of the cross." Such a procedure is *caricaturing* the most sublime teaching. Another class, without entering such extremes, engraft such monstrosities upon their schemes as to make them ridiculous. Thus e.g. Swormstedt (*The End of the World Near*) indulges in *the wildest* conceits, as e.g. Satan occupies the moon ; the moon is the hell of the Bible, and there will be fought a great battle between Satan and the angels ; Satan, infuriated, lashes about with his tail (being the dragon) and hurls some of the guardian angels out of the moon into the earth ; this is done after the bridal tour of the Bride, who alights on *the sunny side* of the moon, having the moon under her feet and the twelve constellations around her—and similar trash which vitiates any valuable suggestions that the book contains, forming a mixture of gross literalism and high spiritualism —all bent to show that the end was chronologically fixed. No book has ever received such outrageous treatment from the hands of its enemies and professed friends. Men, however, of soberness and intelligence have always—whatever mistakes they themselves may have made in interpretation—redeemed it from such unworthy handling.

Take almost any of those continuist interpreters (as e.g. *Eureka* of Dr. Thomas), and we find them largely influenced by their Church views, and constantly seeking for points of attachment. It is not only belief and unbelief that evince great divergencies, but we find it in Protestant and Romanist, High Church and Low Church, professed orthodox and heterodox, sects with peculiar dogmas and schismatics. Much of the interpretation receives a distinctive coloring from the theological standpoint of the interpreter. While some present this almost unconsciously and inoffensively, others bring it forth *most dogmatically and offensively*. Few, comparatively few, have been the writers who have approached this book *unbiassedly*, while some seem to have made it a medium through which to vent their scorn at opposers. With such a spirit, although the claim is loudly sounded "*Eureka*," no symmetrical or consistent interpretation *can possibly* be given. If we take a higher grade of continuists, the main stress of warning, etc., is laid upon these vials, and we are assured that we are now living under the fifth, or sixth, or even at the commencement of the seventh ! (When, as we have briefly shown elsewhere, the very order in which they stand related to resurrected and translated saints, and the culminated Antichrist, shows *conclusively* that they are still future.) Take e.g. the sixth vial as illustrative of the manner in which the language is tortured, and explanations given, to make it fit the present time. Thus the three agents (" three unclean spirits," Rev. 16 : 13) are made out to be Infidelity, Socialism, Ultramontanism, Spiritualism, Monarchical-Republicanism, Revolution, Naturalism, Puseyism, Broad-Churchism, Paganism, Greek-Churchism, Mohammedanism, Popery, Pantheism, Communism, Nihilism, Internationalism, Ecclesiasticism, etc., as it happens to strike the mind of the interpreter to classify three controlling principles or movements now at work. (What these great leading influences or agents are, the true believer will fully recognize, when the time comes, as *the key* will be found in their urging on the last confederation.) The same efforts and diversity to make out a fulfilment is found in the other vials. Such illustrations could be multiplied, and they teach us *how guardedly* we should aproach this Book, lest we add our mite to the number of those who have, more or less, misapplied its predictions. So far as the chronological deductions of many such writers are concerned, time itself has shown that their continuist schemes have not been solidly based. We gratefully acknowledge, however, *the great value* of the researches of this class in symbolism, laws of symbolism, criticism of text, etc., of which the student can avail himself.

Obs. 8. While great advances have been made in interpreting this Book, we believe that God will raise up some, who, for the sake of the truth pertaining to " the Christ," will be enabled to give in regular order a correct interpretation of the Apoc. As the time approaches for its fulfilment, as the interval draws nigh in which its most stupendous scenes will be witnessed, as a preparation to those who shall be persecuted under the Antichrist, as a source of comfort and hope to the believing, and even as a warning to the world, such will be the result. The researches of recent

writers and the fulfilment of prediction before our eyes explanatory of divine utterance, *paves the way* for such a work. Happy the man who shall thus be favored in becoming the instrument of interpreting so glorious a Revelation.

We must believe that the works of Seiss, Burgh, Maitland, Benj. Newton, Todd, Lincoln, Kelly, Brooks, Litch, and others (whatever defects they have, e.g. in departing from the symbolistic idea and insisting too much upon the literal), are in the right direction. The year-day system, once so popular, with its antagonistic applications (as illustrated e.g. in the writings of Bengel, Lord, Elliott, Barnes, etc.) is fast losing ground, not only for the reasons assigned by Dr. Tregelles (*On Daniel*, p. 110), but owing to the widely divergent, and yet plausible, applications, and the flat contradictions to a regular chronological series which it involves. Whatever good it may have accomplished by making out a kind of inchoate fulfilment, it is certain that such a chronological realization as its various schemes affirm, *has never yet* been realized, as seen e.g. by the application made of the sixth seal. We are strongly impressed with the idea that the chief, intended fulfilment will be witnessed *during the interval* between the two stages of the Advent, and this we dare not limit (as some, Lincoln, etc.) to seven years, for the reason that those years only refer to the period of Antichristian persecution, whereas other and great events are included in the interval (which may include seventy-five or more years). No doubt the declaration of ch. 1 : 1, "things which must shortly come to pass," had led many to conclude that there must be of necessity, an immediate and continuous fulfilment from the time the Apoc. was given down to the present. One of the healthy signs of Eschatological study is, that students begin to see that such expressions are not to be measured *by the human standard* of time, but by that *of the Spirit's measure*, who e.g. in Isa. 54, calls a long series of centuries "a little moment." (Comp. with this Dr. Craven's note and ref., to Alford, in Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 89.) A close examination of the tenor of Rev., with a comparison with other Scripture leads us to accept of *the futurist* interpretation as the most consistent and agreeable to the order of the Book. The progress made in this direction is assuring ; and we trust that the defects, more or less, clinging to this mode of application will be removed by succeeding writers. The tendency, so natural, to explain *every detail* of symbolic prophecy relating to the future, leads the best of writers to present merely what they conceive to be the fulfilment, and divergencies and antagonisms spring up between the different interpreters. This might be avoided to some extent, at least, if the interpreter would confine himself simply to *the symbolical* representations, give its meaning, show its attachment to the order of fulfilment and the Old and New Test. predictions, without entering into full details respecting the exact mode, etc., in which it is to be realized. These symbolic pictures being concise, representative of *a leading idea* rather than given to details, much is left to conjecture. Some recent writers begin to realize this more and more, and, while rooted and grounded in the futurist interpretation, express themselves with becoming modesty (dogmatical assertion has nothing to do with symbolistic prophecy) in the manner indicated.

As illustrative of the grave defects of futurist interpreters we select two, who have written largely on the subject, and are well known as having given most excellent and valuable instruction and suggestions on various points. These two, Bagster and Lincoln, vary also in their method of applying the futurist application ; the former incorporates a year-day fulfilment as inchoate to a still future literal-day one ; the latter discards the past inchoate fulfilment and confines himself (from ch. 4) exclusively to a future one. Bagster's theory, so far as the published chronology and analogy existing between the year-day and the literal-day fulfilment is concerned, might be dismissed as not proven by the fact that his estimates, based on such analogy and chronology, have all failed to be realized. The times have passed with a non-fulfilment. His writings are constantly marred by the interweaving of this view, and the utter inconsistency of making the same prediction to speak *two languages* seems never to be perceived. Thus, on the year-day fulfilment the seals, trumpets and vials are symbolistic and not literal (i.e. utter a distinct meaning, which he appropriates), but on the literal-day theory, the same prophecy is literal, and must be literally understood (i.e. giving a meaning very different from the former). Now, such an interpretation and application is *a violation of unity of language and meaning*, and cannot be adopted without doing violence to the plainest rules of language, and especially of symbolistic. To incorporate it into an interpretation of prophecy necessarily leads to confusion and misapplication. Then when we come to the futurist explanation the symbolical or representative nature of the book is lost sight of, and the grossest literalism is presented. Thus e.g. literal hail and fire mingled with blood falls

on the earth ; the third part of trees and grass is burnt up ; a literal mountain or pillar of fire will be cast into the sea ; the third part of salt and fresh water becomes blood, and the third part of the creatures die ; the third part of the waters become literally impregnated with wormwood (i.e some bitter ingredient) ; a great battle is fought in the literal atmosphere out of which Satan is cast ; the interior of the earth (i.e. "bottomless pit") is opened, and literally "swarms of locusts will then come forth on the earth," "devouring every green thing" and "stinging the ungodly," etc. Such a literalism, from which at times he himself recoils (as e.g. in Rev. 8 : 10, the "great star" may "signify an angel or person of distinction," etc.) evidences that the writer has no fundamentally correct conceptions of the nature of symbolic language. Yet a number of writers indulge in this very strain of interpretation, and do great and serious injury to the truth by their gross applications. Lincoln is more consistent in avoiding the contradiction involved by making one fulfilment symbolistic and another literal. But his work on Revelation is likewise defaced by serious errors. We do not now refer to his ultra churchly views and his indiscriminate attack upon all clericalism, to which he makes everything bend (for this we have previously noticed), but to interpretations and applications. Some of these we will now designate. In the delineation of the sixth seal he makes it simply a crisis, preparatory to the trumpets and vials, declaring that "the great day of His wrath is come," was the belief of those frightened ones, but that it had *not yet* come ! This cannot be so, for the reasons assigned under the previous note. It belittles the prediction to favor his order of arrangement. He makes the 144,000 not to be "the Church of God," but Jews, thus showing that he does not appreciate the force *of being engrafted into the Jewish Commonwealth*, the continuation of the election in adopted ones who become "*the children of Abraham.*" While inclined to the symbolistic view, he again and again violates the same by a gross literalism, as e.g. when he has "hordes of lost spirits being allowed to possess the bodies of men," and "the devil and his angels being cast down from (third) heaven to the earth by the heavenly saints." The "bottomless pit" is "the heart or centre of the earth," and "the well" is a shaft leading to this centre, while "the key" to this gives power to loose two hundred millions of "lost spirits" confined in that "centre," who come and possess men as the old demons did in demoniacal possessions. The two witnesses are Elias and Moses or Enoch, who must experience a violent death, as if reserved for such a fate. He has *no* church during the interval, and thus violates the order laid down consecutively in ch. 14. Such and similar comments detract from much that is interesting and valuable. It is sad to find persons who "love the appearing," and earnestly desire to win others to the same love, *weaken* their appeals by the incorporation of such deductions. It seems to be a legacy derived from human imperfection which enters, more or less, into our best performances. Although Lincoln is a futurist, yet, for the sake of making a present application, he again and again loses sight of the future idea, as e.g. under the sixth seal is "found a feeble earnest in some measure in the French Revolution of 1791," and "the frogs" of Rev. 16 : 13 are "stump or loquacious orators" already at work, and the "every unclean and hateful bird" are "*clericals*" who have been such in the past and present, etc. When reading such explanations, one feels (as in the *Eureka*, etc.) that the *animus* of the writer had much to do with the same in order to make out *a preconceived* theory. Personal feeling, theological bias, prejudice must give place to a strict adherence to the meaning of symbolical language. It appears to the writer that one chief defect in numerous expositions is the following : the symbols being seen in vision are *picture-writings*, capable of being reproduced by good artists on canvas, and are *representative of some leading idea* which they are specially designed to convey. Now the seals, trumpets, vials, etc., have been interpreted too much as many persons interpret parables, viz., every particular is made significant, when really intended to fill out the picture, and the stress is not sufficiently laid on the picture as *a whole* or upon *the main idea* represented by it. Take a symbolical picture of the past or present, and no one would be disposed to make *every accessory* to its filling out to denote *a special meaning*, but would be satisfied if he received *the leading idea* intended by the artist. The same is true of symbols in writing, and we can only be assured of a cautious handling of the Apoc. if we observe *this self-evident rule*, observing the simplicity and definiteness of symbolical representations, as illustrated in Egyptian, Oriental, Indian, and biblical symbols. A pictorial representation of the symbols of the Apoc., consecutively given by a competent artist, and carefully studied to catch the main idea conveyed, would certainly aid in getting rid of much looseness concerning them. Such a representation can be mentally made and profitably considered by the interpreter, with the abundant help that is given in symbolistic literature.

In conclusion, we append the opinions of two able men as illustrative of a pervading feeling. Dr. Schaff (*His. Apos. Church*, p. 605) says of the Apoc. : "The purpose of edification it has, in fact, ever served, notwithstanding the very various and sometimes altogether contradictory historical expositions, which it has met even at the hands of truly pious theologians, who in other more important points perfectly agree. We may fully concede the unsatisfactory character of all attempts yet made to explain it, from Irenæus down to Lücke and Hengstenberg—and for our own part we must confess that none of the many commentaries are altogether satisfactory, however much light they may throw on the details—we may be honestly persuaded that the proper key to the full scientific and historical understanding of this remarkable book has not yet been found without thereby being obliged *in the least to doubt its divine origin and high practical value.*" Dr. Bonar in his "Opening Address" at the Prophetic Conference at Mildmay Park, London, says : "I feel uncertain in reference to systems of interpretation of the Apoc. I confess that I do not adhere, I may say, to any of the different schools. I profess to be a learner still in regard to the Apoc., *and I am waiting for light,* and I believe the Holy Spirit will give it, and that we shall erelong, it may be, understand that marvellous book which the Church has been, age after age, trying to comprehend, but which I believe it has hitherto failed in a great measure to unravel." We are learners, "*waiting for light.*"

PROPOSITION 190. *Our views sustained by the addresses to the Seven Churches.*

This is seen in one simple fact presented in all of them. Lange (*Com. Rev.*, p. 114) has well observed: "The *fundamental idea* of all the seven epistles is the fundamental idea of the Apocalypse itself—*the Coming of the Lord.*" This is the key-note of the introductory to, and the solemn admonition and anticipation in, all of them.

Obs. 1. We cannot possibly receive the view entertained by some (Barnes, Stuart, etc.) that these Epistles are *simply historic*, and are only intended for us in so far as the principles laid down and the admonitions given are of general application. The fact that these representations extend to the Second Advent, while the seven historic churches have long since passed away, is in itself sufficient to set aside such an interpretation.

It will not answer to make this Coming of Jesus alluded to in the Epistle, a Coming in providence, or death, etc., because the Coming to which constant reference is made must, in consistency, be *the same* in the introductory, ch. 1 : 7 (which Barnes, *Com. loci*, describes as a literal, personal Coming). To make them merely temporary addresses exclusively pertaining to the seven Churches, so named, in Asia, as destructive criticism suggests, is, of course, to violate the symbolical or prophetic import of those addresses and the far-reaching extent contained within them. To make them (as Litch, *Harmony of Danl. and the Apoc.*) mere pastoral letters, altogether personal to the seven ministers to whom they are sent, and pertaining only to their standing and ministration, is to overlook the Spirit's appeal to "the churches," the direction for all believers, everywhere, to hear and receive, and the fact that the Coming of Jesus is directly asserted respecting them, showing that they then are in existence. Even Lord (*Apoc.*) does not assign to these churches a symbolical or representative character, owing to his adhesion to an (with him) inflexible rule, viz., that analogy rejects the idea of using a symbol or representative of the same species that is symbolized or represented. Now while a general usage is favorable to such a position in the Apoc., yet even there we find exceptions to it, for he himself admits (p. 231) that in the reception of the open book the Apostle is a symbol or representative of other believers (thus a man is representative of men) and (p. 518) the martyrs represented themselves or other martyrs, and (p. 509) Jesus and the saints are representative of themselves. The laws of symbolism as illustrated in ancient and Indian symbolism allow this, as e.g. when man is used to represent man, etc. Aside from this: these churches are first symbolized (ch. 1 : 12, 13) and then the symbol is explained (v. 20), and then after the explanation, the addresses are given on the basis of the explanation. A variation from the species is frequent when e.g. some characteristics, special traits, are to be prominently set forth. The variety of statements, admonitions, cautions, as well as the relationship of the churches to Jesus, made it eminently suitable for churches themselves to be representative of churches.

Obs. 2. We cannot accept of the opinion (so Vitringa, etc.) that these seven churches are typical or representative of seven *successive* periods of Church history. The variety of application made (for no two advocates of this view are agreed as to the time of this succession, or the parties to whom

it is to be referred) evidences the inability of forming such an order of fulfilment—the same being largely influenced by the personal Churchly views of the interpreter. Besides this, not a particle of proof can be found in the Book to show such a succession, but, on the contrary, the warnings respecting Christ's coming to punish or reward as their respective condition will be at such a Coming, clearly proves that they are *not successive*, being in existence at the Sec. Advent.

The applications of Brightman, Moore, and others, in this respect, are repeated by recent writers, as e.g. Swormstedt, who (*The End of the World Near*, p. 60) makes the seven churches symbols of the Church "during seven distinct periods of the Church age, reaching from the Apostolic Church until the end of the Gospel or Church age." So also Barbour (*Three Worlds*, p. 176), and others, who make out *a chronological* succession to suit, as they suppose, the characteristics of each Epistle, long or short, as they find resemblances. *Anything* that can be construed into a likeness is eagerly seized and applied by this class. No matter what contradictions are involved historically or doctrinally, all must bend to their own doctrinal position. We append as illustrations of antagonistic application two recent ones. Lincoln (*Lects. on Rev.*) makes out seven stages, as follows: 1. Ephesus = heart-wrong, clericalism, outwardly wrong; 2. Smyrna = Judaized Christianity, spreading worldliness; 3. Pergamos = union of Church and world; 4. Thyatira = Papacy in full development; 5. Sardis = Protestantism but fails; 6. Philadelphia = those who come out of this apostatizing, a separate group of believers, of which the author is one; 7. Laodicea = final rejection of the professing Church at Advent. Barbour (*Three Worlds*) makes out these: 1. Ephesus = chief, desirable, the first or apostolic phase of Christianity; 2. Smyrna = sweet odor, the Church in the first persecution under the Roman emperors; 3. Pergamos = elevated, the Church at and after the conversion of Constantine; 4. Thyatira = sacrificed, the Church as the woman in the wilderness; 5. Sardis = that which remains, the Church prior to the great Reformation; 6. Philadelphia = brotherly love, the Reformation Church; 7. Laodicea = judgment, the Church at the time of the end. (Compare as antagonisms, a Roman Catholic and a Protestant portrayal of such successions, p. 139, Lange's *Com. Rev.*). Now to indicate the spirit of the interpreter; Lincoln, who (as a "Believer") is intensely hostile, from his standpoint, to the ministry of the Church, must, of necessity, find something to sustain his position of exclusiveness. This he does e.g. in "Nicolaitanism," which means "those who conquer the people," that is, "Clerisy or Clericalism," and hence proceeds to denounce *all forms* indiscriminately. Here we have (1) a dogmatical assumption that he has definitely succeeded in applying this difficult name, and which, whatever its meaning, certainly is not applicable (comp. Church Histories and Encyclops. on the same) to a *godly* ministry; (2) he defames an age of the Church which started out under the auspices of inspired apostles and their immediate successors; (3) history attests that the only form of clericalism which brought the people under its despotic power and was productive of evil, was that which secularized the clergy, made them a superior class, with hierarchical power, while *another party* resisted such encroachments—to make no distinction is to violate the facts of history; (4) that a successive clerisy is unmistakably taught in the New Test., is a self-evident truth, being universally acknowledged, saving by a few one-sided persons; (5) the simple fact, that in all these past centuries God has *abundantly and richly blessed* clericals who have been godly and devoted, should forbid such wholesale denunciation; (6) the fact that clericals have been among the noblest, purest, self-sacrificing, and life-offering people of God, should teach *a discrimination* in the use of "Nicolaitans;" (7) the fact that he can only trace the Church and his own indebtedness for the Scriptures and Christianity to a Church having a "clerisy" should forbid the dishonoring, uncharitable, and exclusive interpretation given by him; and (8) to make out, in behalf of his unjust theory, that "the angel" of the churches is "ominous," a representation of Christendom being away from Christ (after it being expressly asserted, as indicative *of nearness* to Jesus and *special relationship* to Him, that they were held in His hand), only shows *to what extremes* men can go in order to find some supposed support to a doctrinal speculation. No matter how sincere, honest, and even pious, such writers are, their writings *do great harm* by exciting unnecessary prejudice, and disinclining others to study these subjects.

Obs. 3. We are forced by a variety of considerations to accept of one or the other of the following views: 1. That these seven churches symbolize

or represent the general Church and *various phases* in it, more or less continuous in it, down to the Advent. 2. That they are prophetic of the general Church, giving characteristics that shall prevail, but *especially* preceding the Sec. Advent. 3. That the seven churches historically named possessed those special characteristics, and are thus presented as typical of the Church universal in its development *down to* the Coming again of Jesus. 4. That these churches having such traits are representative of seven distinctive characteristic periods without making a succession (i.e. all the characteristics are co-existing), but one more prominent and that just before the Advent, they will be *contemporaneous*. We prefer the simple idea that the seven churches, as they contemporaneously existed, are typical, representative, prophetical *of seven prominent phases or conditions* of the Church, *contemporaneously* present, but becoming more and more *intensive* as we near the Second Advent. The reasons for this prophetical or representative character are the following: it is the introduction to a book of this nature; the entire book, ch. 1 : 4, 11, 19, is designed *for the Church universal* given through the medium of these seven; the Head of the Church is represented in His relation *to the whole Church* by these seven, ch. 1 : 13–19; the "*mystery*," ch. 1 : 20, attached to these seven is indicative of *a prophetic* depth; the number *seven*, as all admit, is *of symbolic import* (Comp. e.g. Auberlen's *Gnomen* and his *Dan. and Rev.*), implying completeness, perfection, etc., and hence "the seven churches represent the Church catholic in its totality;" *the universality of appeal* in reference to hearing, ch. 2 : 7, 11, 17, 29 and ch. 3 : 6, 13, 22; the *appropriateness* of the addresses to the Church universal in cautions, warnings, promises, commendations, rebukes, and encouragements; the past and present *fulfilment of the conditions* specified in the history of the Church (for without attempting a regular succession, it must be admitted that such phases or conditions have always, more or less, existed down to the present); that seven *and only seven* churches, and these by far from being the most prominent, are selected; that these churches are represented *as enduring to the end*, while the literal churches have, for many centuries, fallen; the intimations within them *of a futurity* which cannot be confined to the period of time in which the types or literal churches existed; what was addressed to one church was designed *for all the churches*, showing the non-limitation implied—all which unmistakably shows that far more was intended than seven addresses to seven literal, obscure, individual churches. We have before us an address *to the Universal Church*, which the relation to the Christ, their names, graces, defects, etc., fully enforces.

Lange (*Com. Rev.*, p. 139) makes these seven epistles "*prophetic letters*, constituting the first part of the Apoc. itself, and forming *a foundation* for the whole." "Hence, the life pictures of the seven churches are not merely historical portraits of the Apostolic Church (issued through an episcopal medium, *but of prophetic depth and form*); they are also prophetic types of churchly conditions, which shall hold good *until the end of the world*." While he accepts of an "ideal foundation, the prophetic view of a spiritual world historical process of development (so that "Ephesus is manifestly a picture of the Church toward the end of the apostolic time, while Laodicea pictures it as it shall be in the last time, according to the fundamental traits of that time, as predicted Matt. 24 : 37 sq."), yet he refuses a chronologically formed seven distinct periods of Church history, and adds: "We can affirm *with certainty* that the seven life pictures are continued side by side *through all the ages* of the Church; now one, and now another, predominating; one prevailing at this place, another at that. There have been illustrations of the figure of Jezebel in all ages. And were there no Philadelphia in the very last time, where would the Lord find His Bride?" Trench (*The Epistles to the Seven Churches*) declares

that they are "written for the edification of *the Universal Church*," for "these seven churches of Asia are not an accidental aggregation, which might just as conveniently have been eight, or six, or any other number; that, on the contrary, there is a fitness in this number, and that these seven do in some sort represent *the Universal Church;* that we have a right to contemplate the seven as offering to us the great and leading aspects, moral and spiritual, which churches gathered in the name of Christ out of the world assume." "That these churches are more or less *representative* churches, and they were selected because they are so; that they form a complex within and among themselves, mutually fulfilling and completing one another; that the great Head of the Church contemplates them for the time being as symbolic of the Universal Church, implying as much in that mystic *seven*, and giving many other indications of the same." He forcibly says: "The *seven* must be regarded as constituting a complex whole—as possessing an ideal completeness. Christ, we feel sure, could not have placed Himself in the relation which He does to them—as holding in His hand the seven stars, walking among the seven golden candlesticks, these stars being the angels of the churches, and the candlesticks the churches themselves—*unless* they ideally represented and set forth, in some way or other, the Universal Church militant here upon earth." Dr. Craven in Lange's *Com. Rev.* (p. 140, Amer. Ed.), adopts the view: "1. That the seven churches are representative of the Universal Church; 2. That they are representative of different forms of Church life, each of which *is always existent*, to a greater or less degree, *in every period* of Church history; 3. That they are, in their order, representative of *the predominant* characteristics of the Church in seven periods of her history between the writing of the Apoc. and the Second Advent of Christ." (But of the last, he does not affirm distinct termini.) Dr. Seiss (*The Apocalypse*) takes a similar view, declaring: "These seven churches, then, besides being literal historical churches, stand *for the entire* Christian body, *in all periods* of its history." They "represent seven phases or periods in the Church's history, stretching from the time of the Apostles to the Coming again of Christ." They "represent seven varieties of Christians, both true and false. Every professor of Christianity is either an Ephesian in his religious qualities, a Smyrnaote, a Pergamite, a Thyatiran, a Sardian, a Philadelphian, or a Laodicean." "Nor are we to look for one sort in one period, or in one denomination only. Every age, every denomination, and nearly every congregation contains specimens of each," etc. "If, in dealing with these Epistles, every man, of every age, has a divine thermometer whereby to tell exactly where he and his Church stands in Christ's judgment, and one constructed and delivered to him from Christ Himself for this specific purpose, *then* this fulness and unlimitedness of urgency is comprehensible and fitting; but on any other assumption it degenerates into mere poetry and rhetoric." Such testimonies could be multiplied; for, so far as this representative character is concerned, hundreds of eminent writers in the Church, from an early period down to the present, have urged it *as essential* to a proper comprehension of the epistles. The earliest commentator, Victorinus, fully endorses it; recent commentators, as Bengel, Olshausen, Alford, Lange, etc., adopt it; men of the greatest ability and learning, like Mede, regard it as clearly presented. Thus e.g. Mede (*Works*, b. 5, ch. 10, p. 90) pertinently asks: "If we consider their number, being *seven* (which is the number of revolution of times, and therefore in this book the seals, trumpets, and vials also are seven); or if we consider the choice of the Holy Ghost, in that He taketh neither all, no, nor the most famous churches then in the world, as Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and many others, and such, no doubt, as had need of instruction as well as those here named; if these things be well considered, it will seem that these seven churches, besides their literal respect, were intended to be as patterns and types of the several ages of the Catholic Church from the beginning thereof unto the end of the world; that so these seven churches should prophetically sample unto us a sevenfold successive temper and condition of the whole visible Church, according to the several ages thereof, answering the pattern of the seven churches here." Dr. Schaff (*His. Apos. Church*, p. 604) presents the most simple and consistent explanation, when he makes these churches to "represent *the whole Church* in its various forms and tendencies." Ebrard (*Rev. of John*) makes the churches to be prophetic or typical of actual conditions or states of the Church, not during seven successive periods as Vitringa, etc., not as seven co-existing phases presented by the Church immediately preceding the Advent as Hofman, etc., but partly consecutive and partly co-existent—the first four successive, the last three contemporaneous, extending side by side to the end. (He gives the following scheme: 1. Ephesus = Apostolic Church; 2. Smyrna = martyr Church from John down to Constantine; 3. Pergamos = Church from fourth to ninth century; 4. Thyatira = Church of the middle ages; 5, 6 and 7. = phases springing from the Reformation; (5) Sardis = High Lutherans; (6) Philadelphia = Re-

formed of Europe and America ; (7) Laodicea = no particular church organization, but may be found, more or less, in the general Church. It is readily seen how, in such estimates, men are influenced largely by their Church inclinations, etc.)

Obs. 4. Let us take this representative character of the seven churches, almost universally conceded by able writers, and it is *in full accord* with our doctrinal position. Thus, to notice only a few points indicative of this agreement, let the reader consider the following : 1. The condition of the Church itself—mixed, containing tares and wheat, tempted and tried, false profession and true love, defection and faithful adhesion—is evidence that we have properly delineated the same, and the design of the present dispensation. 2. This condition of the Church existing down to the Sec. Advent, unmistakably shows that no Millennial age can possibly intervene. The prophetic portrayal positively forbids it. It accords only with our doctrinal faith, seeing that such a conversion of the world, as multitudes advocate, is entirely removed from the description. 3. The Sec. Advent of Jesus assumes the prominence that we give it, being urged as warning, encouragement, and hope. It is the special feature, relating to Redemption and fulfilment of covenant promise, which our faith is to grasp and our hearts to respond to in order that it may be to us an inestimable blessing and not a curse. 4. The special promises to incite to faithfulness are not made dependent upon death, but upon this Sec. Coming. In consistency with our position and teaching, the honor and glory to be brought to the redemed is identified with the Coming of the Christ. 5. These epistles unite with this Sec. Advent, the restoration of Paradise and the tree of life, the Millennial exemption from afflictions, sorrow, tears, and death, the exaltation and glorious reign of the saints, the realization of co-heirship and co-judgship with the Christ. These things alone are *abundantly confirmatory* of our expressed belief and interpretation of the Scriptures.

Indeed, these epistles if in agreement with the general analogy of the Word, must, of necessity, make the Church a probationary and preparatory stage, and must designate with special prominence the Second Advent, because then the glorious promises of God, covenanted and predicted, will be amply realized.

PROPOSITION 191. *Our doctrine enforced by the general tenor of the Apocalypse.*

The concluding book of the Canon ought to inform us—being a revelation of the future—when and how the glorious promises, covenanted and predicted, pertaining to Christ, the saints, and the world, are to be realized. This it does in complete harmony with the previous teaching of the postponement of the Kingdom, the design of the dispensation, etc.

So clear and decisive did this appear in the early ages that the opposers to our doctrine of a Pre-Mill. Advent, etc., refused to credit the canonical authority of the Apoc. This we have proven by reference to various authorities in the history of the doctrine. We append several more. Killen (*Ancient Church*, p. 183) remarks : " The Apoc. was acknowledged to be a divine revelation as soon as it appeared ; and its credit remained unimpeached *until* the question of the Millennium began to create discussion. Its authenticity was then challenged by some of the parties who took an interest in the controversy ; but it still continued to be regarded as a part of Holy Scripture by the majority of Christians, and there is no book of the New Test. in behalf of which a title to a divine original can be established *by more conclusive and ample evidence.*" (Comp. Davidson's *Introduction*, vol. 3, pp. 540–555.) Kurtz (*Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 232) says : " The Council of Laodicea omitted from the Canon only the Book of Revelation, *manifestly* from its dislike to, and dread of, Millenarianism." The connection of the Apoc. with the Old Test. can be seen in books specially devoted to the subject, as e.g. in the work of Dr. Tregelles, *Passages in the Book of Rev. connected with the Old Test. Scriptures* (also in his *Book of Rev. in Greek, with a new English Version*). The same is found, more or less, in Keith's *Harmony of Prophecy*, and works of a similar nature. Such a comparison will satisfy the student that the Apoc. is, as many writers have declared, *a most fitting conclusion* of the Canon, summing up in itself the glorious outcome of Old Test. prophecy and New Test. prediction.

Obs. 1. The simple fact—no matter how we may interpret the book as a whole or as to details—that the seals, trumpets, and vials predict such a state of things as only agrees with our teaching, is alone sufficient. Thus e.g. it is only when the seventh and last trumpet sounds that *the Kingdom*, universal, of Jesus is revealed, and—consider it well—linked with (Rev. 11 : 15–18) angry nations, a time of wrath, of resurrection, and of reward. When the Millennial age itself is introduced (Rev. 20 : 1–6) it is preceded by the Personal Advent of Jesus and His saints, and the destruction of a mighty confederation of wicked (Rev. 19 : 11–21). The great revelation of glory, sovereignty, etc., *follows* a series of trial and judgments, in which the Church and the world are both included. No Millennial period, no Kingdom, no triumph, *until the Coming of Jesus.*

This proves that the development theory, so extensively prevalent, has no foundation in fact or scriptural representation. For, instead of a progressive development culminating in the Millennial Kingdom, we have *a fearful culmination of wickedness*, a world in a state similar to Noah's and Lot's time, and a Church tempted and tried, suffering and persecuted. The student must not overlook, as cardinal facts, that *before* the Millennium itself is introduced there *first* comes (Rev. 14) a harvest and a vintage. Everything

in the book evinces that the Church is in constant conflict with antagonistic forces ; that the latter finally so develop and endanger even the Church that Supernatural interference, in the Person of Jesus, becomes requisite in order to crush unholy usurpations by enemies, and deliver His people from cruel persecution. The entire tenor of the book shows that, without a special Advent of Jesus, a special interference by His power, there can be no deliverance of His Church, and no complete subjugation of His enemies. After the Saviour comes, after the infliction of terrible judgments, after events in which Jesus is personally manifested and employed, *then* comes, and *only then*, redemption perfected, and a Kingdom in which dwelleth righteousness.

Obs. 2. This book has for its *end* the covenanted and predicted Kingdom of the Messiah. Dr. Lange (*Apoc.*, p. 402) justly asserts : "That it (the Apoc.) is to be recognized as *the most developed phase* of the New Testament doctrine bearing upon its theme—*the hope of the Kingdom of God and the advent of that Kingdom* in the world—although it is couched in Biblico-artistic, allegorical, and symbolical forms."

The book concludes with *the Messianic Kingdom*, in which those who have part and lot in the first resurrection reign with Christ. The tabernacling of God with men again evinces *its Theocratic ordering*. The greatness and majesty of the King ; His Humanity and Divinity ; His covenanted relationship to David ; His authority and worthiness of homage ; His power to save and His Coming unto salvation ; the Divine Sovereignty ascribed to Him as Deity and a special Kingdom—*a Theocracy*—attributed to Him as Man and upheld by the divine united with Him ; the deliverance, honor, glory brought by His Kingdom—all indicates that the design of the book was, by the description of the King, the coming events, the Advent, the glorious Kingdom, *to confirm the faith in covenanted and predicted promises that the same Theocracy*—withdrawn on account of sin, declared by all the prophets to be restored, postponed to the Sec. Advent—*will be reinaugurated* with sublime accessions under the heir, David's Son. Men may slightingly call this "Judaistic," etc., but let them bear in mind, first, that logical consistency demands this, and second, that the quite early Church, founded and directed by inspired men and their immediate successors, was so instructed that they believed the Apocalypse clearly taught such a doctrine. The book narrowly escaped proscription because the first opponents of Chiliasm believed that it taught the same.

It makes one sad to read how this book is treated by recent writers, some of them professed Christian teachers. We give an illustration : Reuss (*His. of Ch. Theol. of the Apost. Age*), in his ch. on "The Revelation," asserts that all hitherto, in their efforts to explain the book, had been engaged in "a blind search," in an "eager pursuit after an imaginary end ;" and then, after dilating on "sick brains" and "excited imaginations," he undertakes (with, of course, healthy brains and a calm imagination) to tell us how to understand Revelation, which, in his estimation, if we cast aside "preconceptions," is "the most simple, most transparent book that prophet ever penned." After such boldness of assertion, which puts to the blush all that "sick brains" ever before said on the subject, we await with expectancy the proffered solution. It is this : the book is a Judæo-Christian performance, taken chiefly from older writings, very artfully constructed in an overwrought Oriental style, but containing nothing new, being only a re-hash of Jewish expectations, which is fated—having performed its part—to be set aside by progress ! This is *no caricature* that we present of Reuss, but *an epitomized* statement of his position (which honestly concedes, all through, that it clearly and unmistakably teaches our doctrine). His professions of admiration at the skill, poetic fervor, and artistic design of the author cannot blind any one to the fact that he is attempting to take *all truth and life* out of the last Revelation, simply because he finds himself unable to incorporate its Sec. Advent and Kingdom into his Rationalistic system of faith. The truth is that he has no proper conception of *the covenanted and predicted* Messianic Kingdom, etc. According to his high spiritualistic development view, the Apoc. is only valuable as indicative of a formative state, a transition period, which the progress of Theology (human) leaves far behind. The fact is, if his own statements were true concerning it (which they are not), we could only estimate it as a gross forgery palmed off upon the Church. Alas ! how such men help to cause *the lack of faith* in the Church. They, too, shall bear their burden, for it is not *a little thing* to defame this last testimony of Jesus and teach others to do the same. Alas ! many are engaged in this destructive work. Pressense (*The Early Days of Christianity*, Ap., Note, L, p. 500) admits the charge of Lücke, Reuss,

and the Tübingen school, that the Apoc. has a "Hebraic coloring," a "Judaizing tendency," which he attributes to its connection with the Old Test. prophecies, and to a symbolism borrowed from the same. Some writers (as Réville), to account for its Judaic allusions, make the Apoc. to be written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and affirm that the inspired Apostle was at that period still enthralled by "Judaistic illusions"—thus overlooking the key found in the covenanted Kingdom, which explains all.

Obs. 3. The great theme of Revelation is the one, "*He Cometh.*" This is in the introductory; this is presented in the epistles and under the seals, and under the trumpets, and under the vials; this forms the conclusion of the whole. This coming from introductory to conclusion relates only to one visible, personal Coming, answering to the promise of Acts 1 : 11. And in perfect accord with the constant watching posture insisted upon by Jesus and the apostles, and in complete agreement with no intervening Millennial age, the very last caution and injunction is (Rev. 22 : 7, 12, 20), "*Behold, I come quickly;*" "*Surely, I come quickly, Amen.*"

The Pre-Millennial view in the *only one* that can receive this prominence and nearness of the Advent, fully adopt it, and make it an essential element. It has no definite intervening period to neutralize its force, and no substitution for this Advent (as e.g. death) to destroy its redemptive preciousness. Dr. Craven (Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 400) remarks: "that the *Coming* mentioned in verse 7 is the one foretold ch. 1 : 7 (and also Dan. 7 : 13; Matt. 24 : 27, 30 and 26 : 64; Mark 14 : 62; Acts 1 : 9, 11, etc.), seems to be evident by a comparison; and that that Advent has not taken place seems also to be evident upon an examination of the passages referred to, together with their contexts—there has been nothing in history that satisfies the description of events accompanying the Advent. We must look for an explanation of the *quickly* in the declarations of 2 Pet. 3 : 18 and Luke 18 : 7, 8." "In the prayer 'Amen; come, Lord Jesus,' the Apostle pours forth the longing of his instructed heart for the realization of 'that blessed hope' of the Church—'*the glorious Appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*' (Tit. 2 : 13). In this prayer is summed up *all* that the Christian heart can desire—the destruction of the power of Satan; the deliverance of the creature from the bondage of corruption; the banishment of sin and sorrow from the individual heart and from the world; the restoration of all things; the establishment of the Kingdom and righteousness; the beholding by Jesus in fulness of the travail of His soul; the bestowment upon Him in completeness of his promised reward. Let each member of the Church militant, mourning the absence of her Head, but cheered by the promise that He will come again, unite with the Apostle in the longing cry: *Amen: Come, Lord Jesus.*" So Lange in the Introd. (p. 3) finely says: "Therefore, also, does the individual Christian, together with all believing Christendom, *long for* the consummation; and all the objective and subjective goals of longing are summed up in the one aspiration with which the Apocalypse closes: *Come, Lord Jesus.* To this longing and to it alone, is the Apocalyptic Revelation given." Schaff (*His. Apos. Church*, p. 427) says: "The mystic John, the Apostle of completion, was, by his sanctified natural gifts, as well as by his position and experience, predestinated, so to speak, to unveil the deep foundations of the Church's life and the ultimate issue of her history; so that in the Apocalypse the rejuvenated Apostle simply placed the majestic dome upon the wonderful structure of his Gospel, with the golden inscription of holy longing: '*Even so, Come, Lord Jesus.*'"

Obs. 4. The introduction, continuation, and conclusion of the book is designed to urge upon every believer that *the great object* of his love and hope is the Sec. Coming of the Lord Jesus. That is made paramount in his faith, hope, and love; and, consequently, if he devotedly loved his Saviour, believed in His revelation of glory, hoped to inherit with Him in His Kingdom, that Coming must assume *a corresponding and relative importance and confirmation* in his heart and life, in his meditations, prayers, and teaching.

As illustrative of the teachings of others on this point, we present, out of many, the

following. Dr. Seiss (*Apoc.*, p. 31), after having referred to the prominency given to the Sec. Advent, etc., adds : " There is also *a peculiar efficacy and power* in the doctrine of Christ's speedy return. Like a magnet, it lifts the heart of the believer out of the world and out of his low self, and enables him to stand with Moses on the mount, and transfigures him with the rays of blessed hope and promise which stream upon him in those sublime heights. It is the most animating and most sanctifying subject in the Bible. It is the soul's serenest light amid the darkness and trials of earth. And *the great aim and end* of this book (Apoc.) is to set forth this doctrine. The things of which it treats are things touching the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ, and which it describes as 'things which must shortly come to pass.' *The impending Advent* is the theme which pervades it from its commencement to its close. And just in proportion as he who is awake to the great truth of the Saviour's speedy Coming, and is engaged in waiting and preparing himself accordingly, is a better man, and in a safer condition, and really more happy than the half-Christian and the lukewarm ; in that same proportion is he who reads, hears and keeps the words of this prophecy *blessed* beyond other people. This book, at least its subject matter, thus becomes to him an instrument of security and attainment to save him from surprise when his Lord Cometh, and from the tribulations which shall try the indifferent ; as well as a passport to admit him to the marriage supper of the Lamb, and to the highest awards of eternity. Precious book ! and happy they who study it." Again (p. 54–55), "John was present when that blessed One left the earth. He had heard the angels say, 'Ye men of Galilee, this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven' (Acts 1 : 11). He had seen how 'a cloud received Him out of sight,' and thenceforward carried in his memory what the words of the angels authorized him to regard as a picture of something in the future to which he ever looked with the profoundest interest. And all the stupendous visions of the Apoc. did not for one moment disturb that picture, or divert his mind from it. However variously he may have been moved, as scene followed scene in the great exhibition of the Divine Purpose, *the key-note*, to which he ever returned, was the Coming and Kingdom of that ascended Lord. Even in all the long course of unending ages, that upon which his thoughts most firmly fastened was the Coming again of the Lord Jesus. With this he begins, with this he continues, and with this he ends." . . . "'*He Cometh.*' Here is the great fact unequivocally stated. Christ has not gone to heaven to stay there. He has gone for His Church's benefit ; and for His Church's benefit He will return again ; not in spirit only, not in providence only, not in the mere removal of men by death, but in His own proper person as 'the Son of Man.' Few believe this, and still fewer lay it to heart. Many sneer at the very idea and would fain laugh down the people who are so simple as to entertain it. But it is nevertheless *the immutable truth of God*, predicted by all His prophets, promised by Christ Himself, confirmed by the testimony of angels, proclaimed by all the Apostles, believed by all the early Christians, acknowledged in all the Church creeds, sung of in all the Church hymn-books, prayed about in all the Church liturgies, and entering so essentially into the very life and substance of Christianity that without it there is no Christianity, except a few maimed and mutilated relics too powerless to be worth the trouble or expense of preservation. That religion which does not look for a returning Saviour, or locate its highest hopes and triumphs in the judgment scenes for which the Son of Man must reappear, is *not the religion of this book*, and is without authority to promise salvation to its devotees. And those addresses to the churches which have no '*Behold He Cometh*' pervading or underlying them, have not been indited by 'the Seven Spirits of God,' nor sent by Him whose Apocalypse is the crown of the inspired Canon. Murmur at it, dispute it, despise it, mock at it, put it aside, hate it, and hide from it, as men may, it is *a great fundamental article* of the Gospel that that same blessed Lord, who ascended from Mount Olivet, and is now at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead, and to stand again upon that very summit from which He went up. This is true, as Christ Himself is true ; and '*he that hath an ear to hear, let him hear.*' *Amen.*" On the words "Even so, Amen," ch. 1 : 7, he (p. 59) says : "I find in them John's acquiescence in all that the great day is to bring, and his prayer, as repeated at the end of the book, that the Lord would hasten its coming. Terrible as it will be to the wicked, and the unprepared, and those who refuse the warnings which we give them, it is *a precious day* to the saints, a day to be coveted, and to be prayed for with all earnestness of desire. The poor faint-hearted Christianity of our times can hardly contemplate it without trembling and annoyance. Many who profess and call themselves Christians would rather not hear about it, and would prefer, if they had their choice, that Christ might never come. It was not so in the days of Christianity's pristine vigor. Then the

anxious inquiry of disciples was, '*Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of the Coming, and of the end of the world?*' '*Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?*' Then Christians wrote to each other in joyous congratulation, that their citizenship was in heaven, whence they looked for the Coming of the Saviour; and comforted one another in the assurance that the Lord Himself is to descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and, as directed by their Lord, lifted up their heads and looked up with joyful hope at every turn in human affairs which they could by any means construe into a probable herald of His nearing Epiphany. Then the prayer, '*Thy Kingdom come,*' had a depth of meaning and lively anticipation which now has well-nigh been lost. Then 'the appearing of Jesus Christ' had a power over the soul which made it 'rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory;' and the most earnest and constant call of Apostles and their followers was '*Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Even so. Amen.*' Nor can the Church ever be her true self, or enter into the true spirit of her faith, or rise to the sublimity of her hope, where this is not the highest object of her deepest desire. For how, indeed, can we regard ourselves as rightly planted upon the apostolic foundation if we cannot join with heart and soul in this apostolic prayer?" Gerlach (*Bibelwerk*, Rev. 22 : 17) says: "To inflame the longing of the faithful for the return of their Saviour is one of the principal designs of this book." Henry (*Com.* Rev. 22 : 20) declares: "Christ will come *quickly*; let this word be always sounding in our ear, and let us give all diligence that we may be found of Him in peace, without spot, and blameless. '*Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.*' What comes from heaven in a promise should be sent back to heaven in a prayer." (Comp. Props. 182 and 183.)

Obs. 5. It follows, therefore, as the Apocalypse is the Revelation of Jesus pertaining to His Churches; His resurrected, translated, and glorified saints; His judgments; His triumph, Kingdom, and reign; His power, majesty, and glory; His bestowal of the greatest blessings in a perfected Redemption—it ought to receive *our heartfelt and most careful study.* The emphatic declarations of ch. 1 : 3 and ch. 22 : 7 are sufficient. Just in proportion as we love and appreciate the Appearing of Jesus, as we earnestly desire the deliverance, blessings and glory that are dependent on and related to the Second Advent, in *that proportion* will this book, which tells us the grandest and most sublime things of the King and Kingdom, be dear to us. It tells us so much of the Christ and His future glory, so much of the saints and their coming exaltation, so much of the Kingdom of righteousness and its manifestations, so much of the enemies of Jesus and of His people with their ultimate overthrow, so much of the incoming ages and their heavenly excellencies, that it must be—if we love the Coming—*exceedingly precious* to us.

Dr. Craven (Lange's *Com. Rev.*, p. 390) says: "That it is the duty of every Christian to study this book appears from the following declarations of the Epilogue: 1. The Apoc. was given for the information of the saints, vs. 6, 16. 2. It was designed to be read in the congregations, v. 18 (I testify unto every one that heareth); see also comment on ch. 1 : 3. 3. Its utterances were not *sealed*, i.e. closed up from individual comprehension, v. 10. 4. A blessing is to be bestowed upon those who *keep* the words of the prophecy, v. 7; which *keeping* requires, of course, preceding *study.* 5. A woe shall be visited upon all who add to, or diminish from, the words of the Book, vs. 18, 19. The Epilogue, in implying the duty of study, agrees with the Prologue; see ch. 1 : 3." We leave another who has but little sympathy with our doctrine (Smith's *Key to Rev.*, p. 23) inculcate the duty of studying this book as follows: 1. "Our Lord Jesus Christ demands this duty, as well as encourages it;" 2. "The fact that a great section of the Bible consists in prophecies of events then future, tacitly enforces this duty;" 3. "Much of the ancient preaching of a Saviour then to come, was in types and figures not less dark than are most of the prophecies of the Revelation. . . . The condemnation of those who would not investigate that figurative preaching of Christ was their want of faith." 4. "This neglect is to set our own wisdom above the Word of God, and against it, as is manifest." 5. "The prophecies were kindly given of God to warn His people of interesting events, while they are still future." 6. "Events of modern date have much facili-

tated the exposition of prophecy." 7. "The prophecies of Rev. open a rich field of devout contemplation." Even writers who have perverted the Apoc., questioned its authority, ridiculed its "Judaistic tendency and ground," still admit that much that it contains is grand and sublime, worthy of attention and study. The "pilgrim and stranger" finds it "blessed" in his weary pilgrimage and sojourning. (Comp. e.g. Prop. 17.)

Obs. 6. This Book was specially designed to sustain the Christian and the Church *under sore trial*; its magnificent portrayals of ultimate deliverance, reward, and glory at the Coming of Jesus being most admirably adapted for such a purpose. It has done this in the past, comforting and strengthening the persecuted in his flight or in his dungeon, sustaining the martyr at the stake or in the presence of the wild beasts. It has, from the days of John down to the present, consoled, cheered, and confirmed in faith and hope many a depressed, discouraged, tried believer. *It will again do this work* during the interval between the two stages of the Advent, when the Church, enduring her most bitter and unrelenting persecution, *needs special aid and strength* to endure unto the end. Then this Book, so full of the events then experienced, so full of Antichrist and his doom, so full of ultimate glorious deliverance, will be studied *with an interest and intensity* never before realized. Then, too, it will impart *the needed* consolation and hope, so that a multitude, *fortified* by its precious promises, will come out of the great tribulation, and receive their reward for faithfulness and endurance.

Dr. Schaff (*His. Apos. Church*) says: "The Apoc. accordingly is a book of warning, encouragement, and hope, and is best understood practically *in times of trial and persecution.*" "Hypercritics, bringing to the study of the Old and New Tests., not the thankful disposition of children and heirs, but the heartless analytics of a special pleader, may say what they please against it; their own wisdom will be forgotten, but the book that they despise will be hereafter, as heretofore, to thousands of the best and noblest souls *a star of hope* in the darkness of midnight, *a stimulant* to holy desire, *an earnest* of future blessings, and will afford them from time to time *a foretaste* of the new heavens and the new earth, till the Lord shall come to take home His longing Bride." He quotes Bengel as follows: "It (Apoc.) was given to John *in his affliction, and under trial* it is best understood and appreciated. In seasons of great security it was almost forgotten, but under the persecutions by the heathen emperors and those subsequently endured by the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, etc., it has been turned to good account. Many a one too may soon be glad of the book who now refuses to receive it." The last sentence will be in a remarkable manner verified by the thief-like Coming of Jesus; then the book, once neglected and despised, will assume *a prominence and preciousness* which a Pre-Mill. Advent assures. In Bernard's "Progress of Doctrine" (*Bampton Lects.* 8) it is stated that the Apoc. contains *a doctrine of consummation* in the procuring cause (Jesus), in its history (connecting events with a Higher power), in the Coming of the Lord ("the key-note" of the whole book), in the victory announced, in the judgment of usurping power, and in the restoration taking place; and this declaration appears: "Differences and uncertainties of interpretation as to the details of this progressive history still leaves us under the sense that it is the history of the power and Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. This assurance, enjoyed at all times, *grows clearer in the days of trouble, rebuke and blasphemy*, and the darkest times which the prophecy forebodes will be those in which *its fullest uses* will be found."

PROPOSITION 192. *This doctrine of the Kingdom greatly serves to explain Scripture.*

This results from the fact that being a *leading* doctrine of the Bible and embracing the great *end* contemplated, it must *necessarily* serve to interpret passages that are indistinct, obscure, and ambiguous. And this it does without straining such passages into a forced compatibility with the general tenor of Revelation concerning the Kingdom, but by simply allowing the plain grammatical sense to connect itself naturally with the comprehensive knowledge respecting the ordering of the Messianic Kingdom. A few illustrations are appended to indicate our meaning, in addition to the many already presented, and to show how passages, subject to diverse interpretation and contention, can be clearly apprehended in the light of covenanted and predicted Purpose already explained.

Obs. 1. Take simple promises like that of Matt. 7 : 33, "*But seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you,*" while applicable in spirit to believers now (i.e. in inculcating reliance upon Divine Providence), yet, *as given,* is directly applicable to the Jewish nation, and conveys a promise which would have been *specially fulfilled* in their case. This promise was given, *at the time* the Kingdom was tendered to them on condition of repentance, and had they repented and accepted of the Messiah *the temporal blessings* included in the "*all things*" would have been conferred upon them, in accordance with the prediction of the prophets. Again, take more extended promises, which are designedly so constructed as to comfort and sustain believers under all the most trying circumstances of life (even as the greater blessings include the lesser), yet many of these are specifically related to the future. Thus, e. g. Ps. 23, so well known and full of present consolation, only receives its *ample and perfect fulfilment* in the future. This is clearly shown by comparing Scripture and keeping in view the connection it sustains to the Kingdom. Let us briefly present this, as follows: "*The Lord is my Shepherd,*" completely fulfilled when Jesus comes the second time *as the Shepherd,* 1 Pet. 5 : 4; Isa. 40 : 11; Ezek. 34 : 11–23; Jer. 23 : 4, etc.* "*I shall not want,*" which is so distinguishing a feature of the Coming Kingdom that it needs no proof texts for verification. "*He maketh me to lie down in green pastures* (or, *in pastures of tender grass*); *He leadeth me beside the still waters.*" This figurative language, expressive of the supply, protection, and happiness of the sheep, is found in connection with His Coming Theocratic reign, as e. g. Ezek. 34 : 14; Isa. 23 : 21;

* Kings in ancient times, among the Greeks, were denominated "shepherds of the people," and this is in accord with Oriental usage (comp. Clarke's *Com.* on 2 Sam. 5 : 25).

35 : 1, 2, 7 ; 40 : 10, 11 ; 41 : 18, etc. The preceding is fully corroborated by Rev. 7 : 17 being *linked* with Millennial predictions, as in Isa. 25 ; Rev. 21, etc. "*He restoreth my soul ;*" and this, as has been abundantly shown under Prop. 126, etc., finds its completed fulfilment in *the resurrection* allied with the coming again of the Shepherd. The proof is found not only in *the general analogy* of the Word, but in *the phrase* itself. For "*soul,*" as has been proven (Prop. 126), is used to designate the person or body ; and the restoration from Sheol, Hades, or the grave is thus stated, e.g. Ps. 49 : 15, "*God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave,*" Ps. 89 : 4, "*Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave,*" so Ps. 16 : 10, etc. Simple *consistency* must allow an allusion to the resurrection, because otherwise it would not be true that his soul was delivered from death, seeing that the common interpretation of verse 4 supposes a reference to the death of the believer. If it be alleged that a moral restoration is meant this is rebutted by the employment of this phraseology in describing a deliverance from death, as e.g. Ps. 116 : 3–8, etc., "*He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake ;*"—this is so characteristic of Mill. descriptions that it requires no references, "*Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death.*" The "shadow of death" is death itself, as in Ps. 44 : 19 ; Job 10 : 21, 22, and this has led multitudes to infer, wrongfully, that the saint is to experience the death *here* mentioned. But the allusion here is to the fearful slaughter, *awful exhibition of death,* in the valley mentioned by the prophets (Joel 3 : 2, 11, etc.) *at the Advent* of "the Lion of the tribe of Judah" and of His saints. Then His people will witness death, which shall approach them, in its *most terrible aspect,* when the slain shall be over the earth, the blood shall be to the horses' bridles, the beasts and fowls shall have a great supper, etc. (Props. 115, 123, 161, 162, and 163.) "*I will not fear ;*" the saint witnessing (for all shall see it) this terrific destruction of the wicked arrayed against Christ at His Sec. Coming will not fear. This is repeatedly asserted in prophecies relating to this period, and needs no additional illustration ; for then will be fulfilled Ps. 3 : 5, 6, when, after the resurrection (represented by sleeping and then awakening), it is said : "*I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people that have set themselves against me round about,*" etc. "*For Thou art with me ; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me*" (comp. Ps. 118 : 6, 7, 10, 13, 18, etc.). Jesus, then, is personally present (Prop. 121), and hence the assurances of safety, etc. (Zeph. 3 : 8–16 ; Isa. 43 : 2 ; Zech. 9 : 14–16 ; Micah 2 : 12, 13, etc.), are undoubted. The saints then, too, are publicly identified (the ingrafting thus acknowledged) with Israel, "*the rod of His inheritance*" (Jer. 10 : 16, Ps. 74 : 2). Rod and staff being emblematic of power, authority, and rulership, the allusion here is to the predicted reign of Christ, which not only sustains the saints, but in which they shall also participate (Prop. 154). Rod and staff being representative of kingly state or rule (as e. g. Jer. 48 : 17, 29 ; 2 Kings 18 : 21 ; Isa. 14 : 4, 5 ; Isa. 9 : 4, etc.). Christ's kingly authority, manifested in connection with His people, is thus designated, as in Micah 7 : 14 ; Ps. 110 : 2. "*Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies.*" The reader will notice that the enemies are present when the Lord Christ comes with His saints (Zech. 14 ; Rev. 19, etc.), and *two tables* are spoken of as being witnessed by the believer in that day, viz., the table or feast for the beasts and fowls, Ezek. 37 : 17–22, who shall be "*filled at my table,*" etc., significantly called, Rev. 19 : 17, 18, "*the supper of the*

Great God," and also the table, embracing the blessings spoken of by Jesus, Luke 22 : 30, and described, in connection with deliverance from death, by Isa. 25 in "*the feast of fat things.*" "*Thou anointest my head with oil ;*" every student knows that this is an expression indicative of appointment or consecration *to Rulership and Priesthood ;* and hence here denotes the Kingship and Priesthood of those who reign with Christ, Prop. 154 (comp. Ps. 92 : 10 ; Ps. 89 : 20 ; Ps. 45 : 7, etc.). "*My cup runneth over ;* this needs no elucidation, it being sufficient to say that when such blessings as the resurrection, the presence of the Great Shepherd, freedom from evil, kingship and priesthood are experienced, then, indeed, the happiness of the saints will be overflowing, so great and continuous that it is added : "*Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life,*" "*And I will dwell in* (or *return to,* so Clarke, Com., etc.) *the house of the Lord forever* (or, *to length of days*)." The ransomed of the Lord will, indeed, then *return* (Isa. 35 : 10, and 51 : 11, etc.) to the restored house (Props. 122, 131, 142, etc.), and evermore dwell in it as the anointed ones. Thus we find the Ps. descriptive of the happy lot of the saint *at the Second Advent* in the promised Kingdom, containing a *fulness of meaning,* which is only brought out in *its relation* to that Kingdom. Accepting of the abundant encouragement that it gives to faith and hope *now* (for the Shepherd *now* careth for His sheep and supplieth their wants), yet it would be inconsistent to *limit* such glorious promises of the Spirit to a present experience, when they point onward to the time *when* the Shepherd Himself appears with all His gathered sheep in the presence of their (for they are also such to the saints, owing to their peculiar Theocratic calling) enemies, and rejoice in the victory, honor, power, and glory bestowed.[1] Thus a variety of promises receive a deeper significancy and assurance of perfect fulfilment when considered as standing related to this Kingdom. Such e. g. are the passages in John 14 : 12–14 and 16 : 23, 24, for whatever application we may make of them to the present (owing to the mediatorial position of the Saviour and the invitation and encouragements given to prayer) or to the apostolic period, yet such an inchoate fulfilment is far from exhausting its promise. For, aside from its being in one place (John 14 : 12) a general affirmation relating to the future and in the other (John 16 : 22, 23) directly connected with His personal presence, we must not forget that such promises are given, as belonging to the saints, in *that apprehension of time* pertaining to the Spirit by which the intermediate period, so long to man is deemed but a brief period. Beside this, the day is coming, when, as numerous passages testify, such will be the honored position of the saints, such their glorification and resemblance to Christ, that, in this Kingdom, they shall, indeed, *perform great works* and be accounted worthy to receive from the Father the things that they request, owing to their *co-inheriting* with Jesus, "the Christ." Thus promises which are, on the one hand, perverted by fanaticism and, on the other, form a stumbling-block to unbelief (ridiculing non-fulfilment), are preserved *in all their integrity, fulness, and preciousness.*[2]

[1] Those who are disposed to limit this and other similar Psalms to the present dispensation, or who think that they have perfectly comprehended their depth of meaning, may derive a lesson from Luther, who (Michelet's *Life of,* p. 272) professes : "I candidly avow my ignorance as to whether I rightly understand the Psalms in their legitimate sense," and adds : "Others who come after me will, I am aware, perceive much that has escaped me," etc.

[2] Let the Theocratic Kingdom with its restored forfeited blessings, its glorious rule

over the earth, etc., be regarded, and then, when it is fulfilling the Lord's prayer (the spirit of which even Luther located in the future, so Michelet's *Life*, p. 343) in causing the will of God to be done on earth as in heaven, it will be seen that such passages as John 1 : 29, "*Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world,*" etc., are verified on a scale far exceeding the limited view usually taken of them, i.e. confining them more to a provisionary than to an actual realization. Comp. Isa. 65 : 16 ; Joel 2 : 28, 29 ; Zeph. 2 : 11, etc. Such declarations as Ps. 1 : 4, 5, and a host of others are verified when this Kingdom is established and the tares are separated ; the conflict is described in Ps. 2, the result in Ps. 9 ; Ps. 18, etc. (comp. Keith's *Harmony*, ch. 9, which brings Psls. 2, 9, 18, 45, 46, 48, 50, 53, 67, 68, 75, 96, 97, 98, 118, 72, 60, 107, 76, 110, 106, 145–150 in direct contrast with Revelation and other Scriptures—indicating their portrayal of the future). This is a wide field, opening up many a precious vein to the student of the Word.

Obs. 2. An aptness of description, grand in conception and power, is noticeable in various predictions, provided *the time* of fulfilment is carefully observed. Thus e. g. if we take Ps. 93, short but inexpressibly expressive, and locate it (as analogy teaches) just at the opening of this Kingdom, at its glorious re-establishment, it will be found *a song of triumph*, exulting in the majesty of the Theocratic King and the overthrow of the mighty confederation (compared to a great "flood" and "mighty waves of the sea") of wickedness at the end of the age. It is just such *a victorious hymn* as is suitable for the saints (more or less oppressed down to that time), saved from their enemies, to sing. The same can be said of many other Scriptures, such as Ps. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, etc., and eminently serves to illustrate, as we have already stated (Prop. 115), those Psalms (which unbelief, owing to the rejoicing over vengeance and the overthrow of enemies, regards as inconsistent with piety), because the fulfilment of them is embraced at *this* period, and the Theocratic relationship of the saints *of necessity*, calls for the exercise of such power against the mighty confederation of wickedness which would prevent, if it could, the Theocratic arrangement. Froude (Newman's *Gram. of Assent*) may say that "those who accept of the 109th (Ps.) as the Word of God are already far on the way toward *auto-da-fés* and massacres of St. Bartholomew ;" Bunsen and learned men may recoil from "the cursing Psalms" as not "evangelically inspired ;" apologetic writers may lamely attribute them to a past imperfect or degenerate age ; fanatics may claim them as an excuse for persecution and deeds of violence ; but if they are located *at the period* intended by the Spirit and connected with the last culminating outbreak of depraved humanity in open rebellion against the Divine Theocratic ordering (willingly entered into by man), *then the propriety and depth* of such predictions can be realized. So, in the same way, all those passages referring to the coming wrath of the Lamb are to be understood. Now, He is merciful and tenders love to all, but the result will be, as ever, that divine mercy and love will be rejected, believers will be derided and persecuted, etc., *until*, as the Word teaches, the forbearance of God shall cease, and vengeance (now also forbidden to the saints as something belonging only to God, and to be exerted under His authority and direction) shall, *long delayed*, finally come. To intensify this, against the ridicule of unbelief that laughs at all such threats as idle, it compresses it all into the astonishing phrase "*the wrath of the Lamb ;*" thus showing how *the same* Saviour, who loved us even to a shameful and cruel death, will ultimately at His coming manifest His anger against those who wilfully and malignantly reject Him. If we consider what God intends to perform, viz., to set up

the fallen Davidic Kingdom in the glorious manner covenanted and predicted, and then *what opposition* God's Purpose will meet with *at the time* when it is to be accomplished, we have *the key* to the proper understanding of a host of passages describing this wrath, this awful vengeance, this striking through of kings and enemies, this fearful slaughter of the mighty, etc. (such as e. g. Ps. 76, 68, 46, and similar utterances,), and also to the joy of the saints (as expressed e. g. Ps. 48, 98, 113, 97, etc.)

It is a gratification to a Pre-Millenarian, and a strong evidence in favor of his position, that his doctrine alone can incorporate and cordially receive, as veritable truth, the plain grammatical sense and meaning of predictions *in the order* in which they are given. Thus e.g. Zech. 14, in the tribulation of Jerusalem, the Advent of Jesus, the successful fighting of Judah, the plagues, the Millennial glory—all is received *just as recorded*, being in perfect accord with the general analogy of faith. Any system of belief which can do this, evidences by this fact alone that it is *solidly based* on the Holy Scriptures. On the other hand, look at the expositions of our opponents and see how utterly unable they are to explain it, without *undue violence* to its tenor. To refer it (as Grotius, Dathius, Ackerman and others) to the times of the Maccabees, is simply a perversion of the whole, seeing that nothing in the history of those times can sustain such a reference. To apply it (as Jerome, Lowth, Scott, Clarke, Henderson, and others) to the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, is *to neglect the facts* of history which do not correspond, and the connection and relationship existing between the first, middle, and concluding part of the chapter. To get rid of it (as Hitzig, Knobel, Ewald, and others) by a reference to a period immediately preceding the Babylonish captivity, and accounting for its non-fulfilment in history on the ground of its conditionality and ethical intent, is *to pervert* the prophecy and seek a meaning. The opinion (so Hengstenberg, Keil, Chambers, etc.) that it describes in general figurative language the whole development of the Church from the commencement of the Messianic era to its close, or the view (so Moore, Cowles, Newcome, etc.) to a period yet future in which is represented in figurative language an assault upon the Church, her safety, exaltation, blessing, etc.—only shows *how difficult* it is for men, who reject the true idea of the Kingdom and its relationship to the Jewish nation, to interpret and apply such predictions. Their Church-Kingdom theory must make everything bend to its support, and Jerusalem besieged, Judah fighting, the plagues —in brief, everything must be spiritualized and *another meaning* substituted, so that it may be incorporated. The key to the proper comprehension and adoption of such prophecies they do not possess, for they apply all either to the past, present, or future in such a way as either does not accord with the facts of history, or else not with the expressed design of this dispensation.

Obs. 3. Continuing our illustration in this direction, the grand prophecy of Hab. 3 (which, it is said, Dr. Franklin caused literary unbelievers at Paris to acknowledge as the most sublime in language) is selected. The common interpretation which would (against the prophet's *expressly* locating it in the future in verse 16) locate this in the past (as e. g. at the coming out of Egypt and conquest of Canaan), or which would dwarf it by making it a kind of Oriental exaggeration, or specimen of fine writing, or allegorical representation of Divine Providence, etc., is unworthy of reception on exegetical and analogical grounds.[1] Let us in the briefest manner point out *how* this prediction accurately corresponds with the things pertaining to the introduction of the Kingdom. Introductorily, however, it may be remarked, that the Jews regarded this as a prediction relating *to the Coming of the Messiah*, and derived encouragement (as e. g. Jon. B. Uzziel in *Chal. Targum*, p. 221, vol. 1, Bh. Newton's *Diss.*), therefore, that the Jews would be restored ; and this view, after the First Advent, was still retained (applying it to the Second Advent on account of the postponement of the Kingdom and the continued Gentile domination over the Jews) by the primitive Church, and so deeply imbedded was it

in the faith then extant that even Origen in the sixth version of his "Polyglot" renders Hab. 3 : 13 "*Thou wentest forth to save thy people through Jesus the Christ*" (Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 269). This belief has been, more or less, perpetuated, and corresponds with the general agreement of the Word respecting the future. V. 2. "*O Lord, I have heard thy speech, and I was afraid*"—afraid of the fearful manifestations of wrath accompanying this Advent described, and which is implied that the prophet should witness. "*O Lord, revive thy work in the midst of the years,*" or, as some, "*as the years approach*"); God's *special* work, as the covenant with David testifies, is *this Theocratic Kingdom* in David's Son and Lord, and which, when accomplished, the saints are to inherit as "*the work of God's hands,*" Isa. 60 : 21. In numerous places God claims the establishment of the Theocracy, and even its overthrow, the predictions and the provision made concerning it, and its final re-establishment as His own peculiar work. The prophet having already predicted the overthrow of "the special work" that God had commenced in Israel and the subjection of the people under Gentile rule, now directs attention to the *revival* (comp. Ps. 85 : 5–7; Isa. 63 : 15, 17; Hos. 5 : 6) of this work, the covenanted and sure mercies of David. "*In the midst of the years*" (or, "*as the years approach*") "*make known* (Isa. 64 : 1, 2; Ezek. 39 : 7): *in wrath remember mercy.*" (Augustine, *City of God*, B. 18, ch. 32, gives a singular rendering: "While the years draw nigh, Thou wilt be recognized; at the Coming of the time, Thou wilt be shown.") The appeal here is for God to show mercy, inasmuch as the Jewish nation has fallen under God's wrath, and will continue thus until *the time appointed* for deliverance. There also is reference to the fact, that, while wrath is manifested (even as we see it to-day), yet mercy is likewise promised (as e. g. Deut. 32 : 39–43), based upon the oath-bound covenant itself. Now, if the mercy promised to the Fathers is ever fulfilled and the wrath which overturned "the tabernacle of David" and made his "house desolate" is ever removed, it must be in the future and in the way we have already designated, viz., *by the Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ in power and glory.* That such is the hope of the prophet appears from what follows, B. 3, "*God came from Teman and the Holy One from Mt. Paran;*" that this relates to the future (for even the Mohammedans, p. 451, Clarke's *Ten Religions*, thus claim it, referring it to Mohammed) Advent of Jesus has been pointed out in Prop. 166 and the reasons given for the same, so that instead of repeating the proofs there assigned, we shall proceed to notice how the same are supported by the remainder of the prophecy. "*His glory covered the heavens* (Matt. 24 : 30), *and the earth was full of his praise,*" or, as some, "*splendor.*" That this shall be the result of Christ's Advent is reiterated in a multitude of predictions. V. 4, "*And His brightness was as the Light;*" Jesus comes as the bright *Morning Star*, as *the Sun of Righteousness* (comp. e. g. Rev. 1 : 13, 17, and 21 : 23, 24). "*He had horns*" (or, as some, "*bright beams*") "*coming out of His hand; and there was the hiding of His power.*" Remembering that "horns" are emblematic of power, authority (or, if "bright beams or rays" are preferred, considering how the righteous are compared to the stars, etc.); that the horns of the righteous are to be exalted at the Second Advent; that they are represented as "*hidden ones*" (Ps. 83 : 3); that, instead of being "*shut up in the hand of the enemy*" (Ps. 31 : 8), the saints shall be in the hand (Ps. 37 : 24; 31 : 5. etc.) i. e. under the Sovereign disposal,

and identified with the might of God ; that in that period they shall be "*a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord and a royal diadem in the hand of God*," Isa. 62 : 3); and that "*the hand of the Lord shall be known toward His servants and His indignation toward His enemies*" (Isa. 66: 14), it teaches us that the righteous shall be with Him (comp. Zech. 14 ; Rev. 19, etc.) and manifest power and authority (Prop. 154) through His power (Props. 82, 83, etc.); for as Christ rules the assembled nations with a rod of iron, so also do the saints. And hence, just as it is said of Jesus (Isa. 49 : 2), "*in the shadow of His hand hath He hid me and made me a polished shaft*," etc., so saints, the brethren of Christ, those who inherit with Him, are employed (Ps. 149 : 9) "*to execute the judgment written*," thus exhibiting the irresistible power of God. The hand that was pierced holds this power. "*Before Him went the pestilence, and burning coals* (marg. *burning diseases*) *went forth at His feet ;*" this is eminently a characteristic pertaining to the Second Advent, for it is *after* the Coming of the Lord with all His saints that the pestilence, etc., of Zech. 14 : 5, 12, 15, 18 is experienced ; it is *after* the wicked are "gathered together for war" (comp. Rev. 19) that "burning coals shall fall upon them" (Ps. 140 : 10). Ps. 11 : 6 refers to this time : "*Upon the wicked He shall rain snares, fire, and brimstone* (Rev. 19 : 20), *and a horrible* (marg. *burning*) *tempest. This shall be the portion of their cup.*" (Comp. Ezek. 38 : 20–22, etc.). V. 6, "*He stood and measured the earth ; He beheld and drove asunder the nations ; and the everlasting mountains* (Luther : Welt Berge) *were scattered, the perpetual* (or long-enduring) *hills did bow ; His ways are everlasting.*" This gives a vivid representation of the supremacy, dominion and power exercised by King Jesus, that all things, including the whole earth and its nations, are under His control and submit to His commands. And, keeping in view prophetic usage in which Kingdoms and States are denoted by mountains and hills, long-enduring and great powers shall be overthrown, the heads over many countries shall be wounded, and a feast for the beasts and fowls shall be prepared (Rev. 19 : 17, 18) out of their sustainers. V. 7, "*I saw the tents of Cushan* (or some, Arabia, others Mesopotamia, others Ethiopia) *in affliction and the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble*"—indicative not only of the extent and power of the swayed "rod of iron," but points even to localities where vengeance will be specially manifested. V. 8, "*Was the Lord displeased against the rivers? Was thine anger against the rivers? Was Thy wrath against the sea?*" The force of this is seen by accepting of the fact that "rivers" are symbolic of invading armies, hostile kingdoms, and overflowing invasions, as e.g. in Jer. 46 : 7, 8, Egypt is represented as "a flood whose waters are moved as rivers," in Jer. 47 : 2, "waters shall rise up out of the north and shall be an overflowing flood ;" and in Isa. 8 : 7, 8, the King of Assyria is called "a river" that shall "overflow" Judah. "Sea" is a prophetical word which *intensifies* this meaning, denoting a vast army, a mighty confederation, or a great, tumultuous gathering, as e. g. Isa. 51 : 42, "the sea is come upon Babylon, she is covered with the multitude of waves thereof" (comp. Nahum 1 : 4 ; Ps. 89 : 9 ; Isa. 5 : 30 ; Ezek. 23 : 6, etc.) We are assured that just such "rivers"—viz., "*the kings of the earth with their armies*"—just such a "sea"—viz., "*the kings of the earth and of the whole world gathered to the battle of that great day of God Almighty*"—shall arise, (*vide* Props. 115, 123, 161, 162, 163, etc.). "*That thou didst ride upon thy horses and thy chariots of salvation.*" This reminds us of the lan-

guage employed in Rev. 19, descriptive of the Second Advent, in which this "King of kings" together with his army are represented as riding upon horses. This *similarity* of representation, together with *the same result*, viz., salvation, identifies *the period* of fulfilment. (We are also reminded of "the chariots" of Ps. 68 : 17, see Prop. 166). V. 9, "*thy bow was made quite naked, according to the oaths of the tribes, even thy word*" (Augustine renders : "Bending, thou wilt bend thy bow against the sceptres, saith the Lord"). Taking our version and the correction of Clarke (*Com. loci*) "according to oaths of the tribes," then the idea seems to be that the bow made naked or uncased (taken out of its case) is declarative of God being *now fully prepared* to wage war (Ps. 7 : 12, 13 ; Ps. 45 : 45) and to fulfil the covenant and promises which were *confirmed by solemn oaths* to the twelve tribes (comp. Acts 26 : 6, 7) of Israel. Whatever version may be adopted, it is descriptive of *His ability* to overcome ; and the reference to the tribes, recalling Zech. 9 : 11–17 ; Isa. 41 : 2–4, etc., implies that this Man of war is engaged *for their deliverance.* "*Thou didst cleave the earth with rivers,*" or, marg. read., "*Thou didst cleave the rivers of the earth ;*" that is, He subjects the Kingdoms of the earth, Zech. 14, etc. etc. V. 10, "*The mountains saw Thee and trembled*"—expressive of the majesty of this great King, at whose glorious Presence the Kingdoms will be put to fear, Isa. 2 : 10–22 ; Rev. 6 : 15, 16, etc. "*The overflowing of the water passed by ; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high.*" This massing of waters (i.e. confederation of people) shall be beaten back (as e.g. Ps. 93 : 3–5) and placed within bounds. V. 11, "*The Sun and Moon stood still in their habitation.*" Some think that there is here an allusion to Joshua (10 : 11,12) and the miracle then performed, and that this is simply introduced to denote that by supernatural means these enemies are destroyed. But we go beyond this, viz., that it directly teaches that when He comes, far greater than Joshua, to destroy His enemies, *that a miracle similar to Joshua's will be performed.* That very miracle, which above all others has been *the standing jest* of unbelief (which fails to see *why* it was wrought both in virtue of the nation's Theocratic relationship and as *an earnest* of the supernatural power exerted when the Great Leader and Judge of the nation appears), will *be repeated*—as if in derision of man's supposed superior knowledge—when unbelief has reached its culminated point and forms a dreadful confirmation of long-delayed but now experienced vengeance ; seeing that nature itself, upon which unbelief so proudly and arrogantly relied, *contributes* to the certainty of their doom. In the light of various Scripture, and recognizing the similarity of these engagements, we dare not limit the direct statement of the passage, but believe, that as the Theocratic position, in the effort to overcome its enemies, was thus sustained, *so it will be again*, as asserted, when *the same Theocratic ordering* under the Mighty King Himself shall be maintained against the kings of the earth and their armies. Yea, we may anticipate even a *greater miracle* in connection with this one (comp. e. g. Isa. 24 : 23 ; Joel 3 : 15 ; Matt. 24 : 29, etc.). "*At the light of thine arrows they went ; and at the shining of thy glittering spear,*" or, as some, "*By their light, thine arrows went abroad ; by their brightness, the lightning of thy spear,*" comp. marg. read., etc.—holding up the idea of a mighty conqueror marching in "the greatness of his strength," and overcoming all opposition, or performing this in the miraculous light of the sun, etc. V. 12. "*Thou didst march through the land in thine indignation ; Thou*

didst thresh the heathen in thine anger—with which it is only necessary to compare Isa. 63 : 1–5, Micah 4 : 11–13 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 7–10 ; Rev. 19, etc.—(Augustine has : "And in fury Thou shalt cast down the nations"). V. 13. "*Thou wentest forth for the salvation* (Isa. 35 : 44, 24 : 9) *of Thy people, even for salvation* (Rev. 12 : 10) *with Thine anointed*" (some MSS. and some copies of the Septuagint, see Clarke's *Com. loci*, have "*anointed ones*")—it is at this period that King Jesus comes *the second time unto Salvation*, Heb. 9 : 28, and delivers His people ; and when He thus comes, He has His anointed ones (viz. the saints accounted worthy of rulership) to participate with Him in the infliction of judgments as stated, e.g. Ps. 149 : 6–9, Rev. 2 : 26–27, etc. "*Thou woundest the head out of the house of the wicked, by discovering* (or making naked) *the foundation unto the neck.*" The confederation of the wicked under a leader or head is alluded to, and the utter subversion (Ps. 110 : 6) of the same ; the house laid bare even to its foundations, destroying it root and branch (as e.g. Mal. 4) fully indicates it. V. 14. "*Thou didst strike through with his staves the head of his villages :* (or as Clarke : *Thou hast pierced amid their tribes the head of their troops*) *: they came out as a whirlwind to scatter me ; their rejoicing was as to devour the poor secretly.*" The same idea of the coming and overthrow of the last, gigantic confederation, is presented with the additional hint of the at first *covert* design of the house of the wicked, viz.—to overcome and root out the people of the Lord. V. 15. "*Thou didst walk through the sea with thine horses, through the heaps of great waters*"—descriptive of the power of King Jesus, that, notwithstanding the greatness of this confederation, He can safely and triumphantly resist it, for it is expressly predicted of Him (Ps. 89 : 23–25) "*I will beat down His foes before His face and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with Him ; and in my name shall His horn be exalted. I will set His hand also in the sea, and His right hand in the rivers.*" V. 16. "*When I heard, my belly trembled ; my lips quivered at the voice ; rottenness entered into my bones and I trembled in myself, that I might rest in the day of trouble ; when He cometh up unto the people, He will invade them* (or, *cut them in pieces*) *with His troops.*" The prophet trembles at the description of this day of sore affliction and tribulation, of carnival, of pestilence and sword, of the vintage of blood, and prays for the "*rest*" (comp. 2 Thess. 1 : 7–8), the deliverance that Jesus will bestow (Rev. 11 : 18) upon His saints at His Coming with His "troops," or "the armies of heaven." The desire of the prophet to be among those who shall have "rest" in that day, thus showing that this Advent *is future*, at once disposes of a vast amount of erroneous interpretation fastened upon the prophecy. V. 17. "*Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines ; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat ; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls.*" This is connected with the same period of time (comp. Luther's rendering) as something that shall also be witnessed. Nature itself shall be affected so that failures of fruit and crops, and plagues upon cattle, greatly tending to the hardships experienced, shall be sent upon the world. This corresponds with various other Scripture (Prop. 174) relating to the period of the Sec. Advent. Since men have set aside the God of Revelation and the Son of His Love, and have relied upon nature, making it their God, nature itself shall *justly be employed* in their signal punishment and in a manner so striking that it brings (Luke 21 : 25–26) "*distress of nations with perplex-*

ity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." Or, if the reader insists upon referring this verse, according to some versions, to something that the nation then and afterward was to realize, then the idea is, let all the threatenings of God relative to the Jewish nation be verified in their suffering and desolate condition yet God's covenanted promises, after the season of affliction, shall not fail (see the connection with following). V. 18 "*Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation*"; or as the Vulgate makes the reference: "*Yet I in the Lord will rejoice, and will exult in Jesus my God*—that is, either because of the "rest" obtained at this time of tribulation, or because God's mercy, notwithstanding the evil brought upon the nation, will bring glorious restitution. V. 19. "*The Lord God is my strength*"—now indeed at the contemplation of those scenes in the future I may tremble through my weakness, but then God will save and strengthen me, so that I shall pass through them unscathed. Yea, more than this: "*He will make my feet like hind's feet and he will make me to walk upon my high places*"—expressing the exaltation of the prophet at this day *after* (Rev. 11 : 18) the Advent of "the King of kings," being then also a "*King and Priest*," in the allotted "*high places*," reigning with Christ, participating in His divine administrations and government. Thus passing over this prophecy and allowing the things pertaining to the ushering in of *this Theocratic Kingdom* to aid in its interpretation, we find that, instead of its referring to the past or instead of being simply a specimen of sublime writing (exhibiting "versatility of imagination," etc.), it presents us in the most forcible manner *stern realities and joyful anticipations*—"*the treading of the wine-press*" *and* "*the salvation*" *of God's people—connected with the Second Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ.* The rebuke of Jesus, Luke 24 : 25, is applicable to many, who, with perverted notions of the Kingdom, fail to see how the prophets with *one voice* testify to the Coming and marvellous power of David's Son and Lord. Dr. Keith in *Harmony of Prophecy* properly calls attention to this in comparing the Song of Moses, a number of Psalms, prophecies of Isa. this prayer of Hab., etc. with the Apocalypse and other Scripture, and in abundantly showing that a comparison of Scripture indicates *how largely* the spirit of prophecy deals with the things pertaining to the Sec. Advent.[2]

[1] Even Fairbairn (*On Proph.*, p. 171) not knowing what to do with this prophecy, and failing to catch its connection, makes it a providential Coming of God to punish sin, "first among the backsliding Jews and then among the proud and lordly Chaldeans;" and he and others interpret the Coming from Teman, the mention of Paran, etc., as language taken from the past to heighten the effect; or, to be plain, a poetical license is taken to give proper coloring to the picture. Alas! when able writers thus explain prophecy, what confidence can we have in its inspiration? How can we possibly discriminate the play of fancy or imagination from the intended realities? Such interpretation is both dangerous and derogatory to the Word.

[2] This was written before the writer saw Delitzsch "On Habakkuk" (*Bib. Repos. and Princeton Review*, Jan., 1851), who rejects as utterly untenable its reference to the past, and decidedly advocates the prophetic sense, rendering "God came" by "God shall come," in the future in a grand descent to judgment upon His enemies, and that in the final conflict there will be a terrible overthrow of nations in the route and manner indicated. He, however, makes the mountains, hills, and rivers too literal, overlooking too much *the analogy* of Scripture figure in this respect. Fully admitting that nature itself will be in full sympathy with this Coming and manifest its feeling the Supernatural power of its Creator and Redeemer, yet why should God's wrath be kindled against *inanimate* objects? Analogy teaches us that it is to be manifested against *animate* objects,

forming an Antichristian confederation against Him and His people. He makes "the bow" made "bare" to mean "stripped from its covering so that it may be ready for use," and "the arrows" "sworn by Thy Word" to express that "the command of God has bound them by oath to execute their commission, they shall not fail to strike wherever they are aimed;" i.e. the entire prophecy indicates the certainty of this Coming vengeance and deliverance. He applies "to save His anointed" to the King, to Jesus as the Davidic King (the Son of Man), and if this reference is intended, it finds corroboration in other Scripture, as e.g. Dan. 7; Ps. 22, etc. Having a correct and definite view of the future covenanted Messianic Kingdom, associated with His saints and the restoration of the Jewish nation, enables one to avoid that indefinite reference to a future Coming, so characteristic of numerous expositions (as e.g. Lange's *Com. on Hab.*, and the references). Even Luther (quoted, p. 40, in Lange) could not refer all to the past and present but brings in the future, as e.g. on v. 19, "The Lord is still my God. Of this we will be so glad, that we will run and spring like hinds, so nimble are our feet to become; and we will no longer wade and creep in mire, but for perfect delight we will soar and fly in the high places, and do nothing but sing joyfully, and pursue all kinds of delightful employment. This is to take place when the Babylonian sceptre is cursed and destroyed, and we are redeemed and the Kingdom comes." In Fausset's *Com.* are found some interesting statements, especially in the rendering "according to oaths" to mean "Thy oaths of promise to the tribes of Israel, Ps. 77 : 8; Luke 1 : 73, 74;" "Thine Anointed," which may mean, as some, "the Messiah," or, as others, "Israel," the anointed people, or, as others, "the Messiah and His anointed ones," etc.

Obs. 4. The doctrine of the Kingdom not only serves to explain what otherwise would be inexplicable (as e. g. the Married and Barren Woman, Prop. 118, references to the morning, Prop. 139, etc.), but aids materially in confirming renderings of the Scripture not correctly given in our version, in explaining the meaning of *Scripture phraseology*, and in interpreting passages upon which a variety of opinions have been offered. Having given examples of the first (as e.g. the end of the world, Prop. 140, etc.)[1] and of the second (as e.g. the meaning of Judge and judgment-day Props. 132 and 133, etc.), it will be sufficient to illustrate the third advantage, viz.—that in the passages where a variety of conflicting views exist, the correct interpretation will be suggested. Thus, e.g. take the celebrated prophecy of the Shiloh, Gen. 49 : 10, "*The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be.*" Amid the great diversity of renderings[2] only a few of them, sustained also by excellent critical authority, are in correspondence with *both* the requirement of historical fact and of other predictions. Our version, together with many others, is *not* in agreement with fact, for *the sceptre had departed* from Judah *long before* Jesus came, and His First Advent occurred when the Jews were under the Roman dominion. Hence one of the following renderings, admissable according to the original must be adopted. The most preferable is given first as follows: "*The sceptre shall not be removed from Judah nor the lawgiver from between his feet forever; for Shiloh will come, and to Him shall the gathering of the nations be*" (so e.g. Lederer, Editor of the *Israelite Indeed*, Jan. No., 1863, p. 157, Rev. Wilson, Editor of *Proph. Times*, new series, June, 1875, p. 139). This translation is also that of the modern Jews who instead of following the masoretic notes give the signification "*forever*" (and which also belongs to it,) to the word usually translated "*until*"—the latter word being a favorite as it was supposed to point out the first Advent, etc. Taking this rendering we have still a strong Messianic prophecy (made the stronger because perfectly accordant with historical fact,) but directing the eye of faith *onward to the Second Advent.* It then teaches, that although (implying what really occurred, the over-

throw of royalty,) the dominion or power shall be taken away from Judah, *yet it should not be "forever," i.e. perpetual, for the Messiah would come and re-establish it* so gloriously that other nations would recognize and acknowledge His sway. It is simply concisely stating a fact, which Ezek. 21 : 26, 27 has amplified, viz. that the regal power would be taken away from Judah, and remain *thus until* the Christ comes to restore it : "*Remove the diadem and take off the crown. . . . I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more, until He come whose right it is and to Him will I give it.*" We live in the days of fulfilment, but are directed to believe (as our entire argument from covenant, prophecy, and history proves) that *this withdrawal* of Kingly rule shall not be "*forever ;*" but that the removed sceptre, and suspended law-giving authority—the crown profaned by casting to the ground Ps. 89 : 39—*shall again be restored* when the throne and kingdom of David shall be re-established by the Coming David's Son and Lord. The next rendering is that of Bh. Newton (On the Proph. p. 50), following Bh. Sherlock, who translates : "*The tribeship*" (i. e. the rod or staff which the word usually rendered "sceptre" also denotes the ensign of a tribe, hence the tribe itself as under one rod, etc.) *shall not depart from Judah, nor a Judge from between his feet, until Shiloh come and to Him shall be the obedience of the people.*" This, while open to objections, yet, if it can be referred to the tribeship of Judah (comp. Bush on Gen. who advocates it), would sustain fact, viz. the distinction of being a tribe and of having expounders of the law down to the First Advent. The latter clause would only then, probably, refer to the Sec. Advent, seeing that the nation was dispersed and the saints were scattered over the Roman Empire, etc. Kurtz (*His. of Old Cov.*, vol. 2, p. 27 etc.) gives the following : "*The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's rod from the place between His feet, till He attain to rest, and the nations obey Him.*" Several other versions[3] are given, varying but little from the last, and the impression is largely gaining ground among the ablest of critics, that the prophecy contains the prediction that the Sceptre shall in some way be identified with Judah, *still in the future*, when this sovereignty shall command the obedience of the nations. This accords fully with the general analogy of Scripture on this point; Kurtz, Baumgarten, Hävernick, in brief, a large number of able writers declare, whatever inchoate fulfilment there may be in the past, that Jacob's predictions to his sons respecting "*the end of days*" have reference to "*the closing period, the end of days, the time of fulfilment, in a word, the Messianic era,*" and hence largely pertain to the future. Of course, Millenarians, comparing Scripture with Scripture, have always taken this position, viz. that at the future restoration of the nation these promises will be abundantly verified, and pre-eminent among them the one to Judah, owing to his special nearness to the King.[4] Whiston (*Boyle's Lect.* vol. 2. p. 311) presents the general opinion when thus referring the fulfilment to the Sec. Advent and restoration of the nation, because if we *limit* these prophecies to the past then indeed *history does not sustain their grandeur and extent*, and especially because in the prophecies—more detailed—respecting this nation (Prcps. 111, 112, 113, 114), precisely such an exalted fulfilment is again and again declared to await it in the future.[5]

[1] A correspondent of Dr. Clarke's, "M. A. B." gives a consistent rendering to Zech. 2 : 8, 9 (Clarke's *Com. loci*) : "For thus saith the Lord of hosts, who hath sent me (so also Luther's version) the future glory (or the glory which is to come) unto the nations,"

etc. Sirr (*First Res.*) translates 2 Thess. 1 : 9, "Who shall suffer punishment, the slaying (*olethron* being used by the Sep. in 1 Kings 13 : 3, 4) from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His might, in that day, when He shall come to be glorified," etc. Whatever verbal change a critic might suggest, yet it is true as Sirr suggests that this slaying corresponds with Isa. 66 : 15–17, Rev. 19 : 21, etc.

[2] We reproduce a number for the reader's information, and especially as some of them are interesting as evidence of Jewish opinion respecting its reference to the Messiah. *Sep.*—"A Prince shall not fail from Judah, nor a captain out of his loins, until the things come that are laid up for Him," or as Eusebius in another copy : "Until He shall come for whom it is reserved." *Chal.*—"One having principality shall not be taken from the house of Judah, nor a scribe from his children's children, until the Messiah come whose the Kingdom is and Him shall the people obey." *Targum of Onkelos.*—"There shall not be taken away one having the principality from the house of Judah nor a scribe from his children's children, till Messias come whose is the Kingdom, and whom the nations shall obey." *Targum Jerusal.*—"Kings shall not fail from the house of Judah, nor skilful doctors of the law from their children's children, till the time when the King Messiah shall come, whose is the Kingdom and whom all the kingdoms of the earth are about to serve." (The *Babyl. Targum* also makes it refer to the Messiah : "The Messiah shall come, whose is the Kingdom"). *Syriac.*—"The sceptre shall not fail from Judah, nor an expounder from between his feet . . . and Him shall the peoples wait for." *Samar.*—"The sceptre shall not be taken away from Judah, nor a leader from his banners, until the Pacific shall come, and to Him shall the people be congregated ;" so Prof. Bush, *Com. loci.* *Arab.*—"The rod shall not pass away from Judah, nor a lawgiver from under his rule, until He shall come whose He is, and to Him shall the people be congregated." Augustine (*City of God*, b. 18, ch. 45) : "There shall not be lacking a Prince out of Judah, nor a teacher from his loins, until He shall come for whom it is reserved ; and He is the expectation of the nations." *Douay Bible :* "The sceptre shall not be taken away from Judah, nor a ruler from his thigh, till He come that is to be sent, and He shall be the expectation of nations."

[3] We give the one found in Cox's *Coming and Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ*, p. 79 : "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet *eternally*, because Shiloh shall come and gather the people unto Him." The gathering, Cox justly argues, implies a previous scattering, and the whole predicts that although (as Hos. 3 : 4, 5) the sceptre shall depart, yet it will return with the Advent of Shiloh, etc. This agrees with the first rendering which we have given. Kurtz's version (as well as that of the Eng. Ver. and many others commonly received) is opposed *to fact* as already observed. The best effort to make it consistent with history is that of Rollins (*Anc. His.*, vol. 4, p. 282) who endeavors to make out a fulfilment (1) in the continued pre-eminent existence of the tribe of Judah over the other tribes, and (2) that when Herod, the Idumean, a stranger was made king, the tribe lost its pre-eminence and authority, which was after the Messiah had come. The facts of history show, however, that Judah itself was frequently subject to foreign authority, etc., long before the Advent.

[4] While upon the subject, it may be regarded advisable briefly to consider the objection alleged against the rendering of Shiloh in a Messianic sense. Eichhorn, Bleek, and others, following the example of some modern Jews, make Shiloh a city of Ephraim. This has been fully answered by Hofman, Kurtz, Hengstenberg, etc., and proven to be inadmissible. Dr. Etheridge, in his Introd. to *Targums of Onkelos*, etc. (vol. 2, p. 19), says that Shiloh is the name of the Messiah ; that some modern Jewish interpreters make it the name of a place and read "until or even though they come to Shiloh ;" but this "does violence to the very grammar of the words. Shiloh is the nominative and the verb is in the singular, 'He shall come.' The *Targums* translate Shiloh by 'the King Messiah ;' the Palestine one describes Him as a 'Son of Jehudah.' The *Talmud* (Sanh.) takes the same view. So does Aravanel in his *Com.* on the text ; and that found in the *Zohar* lays down the same doctrine with the addition that the letter i, yod (the initial of Jehovah) in the name, indicates that the Messiah will be *a divine person.*" Kurtz and others assert that not only the ancient synagogues, but the early Christian Church without exception referred this passage to a personal Messiah. Those who advocate it as not alluding to a personal Messiah give us several interpretations ; "till he or one comes, or they come to Shiloh," or "till rest comes," or "till he or one (relating to Judah) comes to rest or the place of rest." On the other hand, those who favor a reference to a personal Messiah give us : Shiloh as a proper name of the Messiah "until Shiloh come," or (as Samaritan) "Until the Pacificus, i.e. the Peace-maker, comes" (comp. Bush *Com. loci*, "the Tranquillizer, the Pacificator, or the Giver of Peace"), or (as Sep.) "Until the

things come which are reserved or laid up for Him, or (other copies) "Until He for whom it is reserved comes," or (as Vulgate) "Until He who is to be sent comes," or (as Junius, etc.) "Until his (Judah's) Son comes," or (Luther's Version) "Until the Hero comes," or (Gesenius) "Until the Rest (of the Messianic age) comes," or as others explain the last, "the Bringer of Rest or the Man of Rest comes." Le Clerc (Bh. Newton *On Proph.*, p. 53) stands almost alone, "Until His end or ceasing."

[5] Some writers (as e.g. Russell's *Object and Manner of the Lord's Return*, p. 8) make this promise to be "fulfilled to the letter," by making the sceptre to be merely "the symbol of nationality," and that "that tribe (Judah) represented the nation until the Christ came." Many concur in this, being desirous to make out a fulfilment in favor of Jesus at the First Advent. It is sufficient to say, aside from what has been stated, that the connection points more especially to the Second Advent, when "the gathering (or obedience) of the people" shall—as repeatedly predicted—be abundantly verified. Some of the applications are strange, as e.g. Gregory (*Four Gospels*, p. 58) makes Shiloh fulfilled in Herod the Great, which, aside from Herod being a Roman and not a Jewish king, does not cover the continuity of the prophecy and the predicted result. (When Joanna Southcote pretended that she was to bring forth the Shiloh, the very opposite extreme was entertained by Sir W. Drummond, who made Shiloh the ancient Asiatic name of a star in Scorpio! Numerous vagaries have been fastened on this prediction.) We must not overlook the fact that this central prediction of Judah stands related to "*the last days*" mentioned in the beginning. This expression (comp. e.g. Lange's *Com. loci*, p. 649) "at the end of days" does not denote "the future in general, but the closing future, in fact, the Messianic time of completion" (with which compare its usage in the New Test.). We cannot, therefore, accept any interpretations which would limit it to the past, or make it non-Messianic, or give it vagueness and indefiniteness of expression. It is sufficiently distinctive and determinate if interpreted by the facts of history and the Divine Purpose relating to the still future covenanted Messianic Kingdom. We are glad to find that recent Jewish writers take the position we have done in the text. Thus e.g. Isaac Leeser, in his *Translation of the Old Test.*, gives, among others, the following rendering: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah nor the lawgiver from his descendants *forever*; because Shiloh shall come; and to Him shall be the gathering of the nations." He appends this significant sentence, expressive of his own opinion: "The sceptre will *return*, when the Shiloh, the King Messiah, shall come, and to Him shall be both the obedience and the assembling of people or nations." This is *precisely* what the general analogy of Scripture teaches, and this sublime prediction is in full accord with the same.

Obs. 5. Balaam's prophecy, which has provoked the ridicule of unbelief, will find its strongest support in the Theocratic relationship of the Jewish nation, by which even an enemy was made, unwillingly, to testify to the same. The miraculous intervention sprung out of the fact, that God was *then* the acknowledged earthly King of the nation, and that it was *eminently fitting* for one outside of the nation to predict the irresistible power of the Theocracy and the certain overthrow of its enemies. Hence the repetition of it, enforces the idea of its certainty to conquer—however long delayed—all opposition. The remarkable part of the prophecy is, that, aside from the general affirmation bearing upon this point, it even passes from the present—as if foreseeing the downfall of the Theocracy and the miserable condition of the nation for centuries, and yet not allowing the mouth of an enemy to proclaim it—*to the far distant future*, and enters into details respecting the triumphant Theocracy *then established* with this same elect people who then shall overcome a still more formidable confederation, etc. It will richly repay us to direct our attention to portions of the prophecy illustrative of this passing from the present to the future, —from the existing Theocratic ordering *to that of the future one* under the Messiah—for it will confirm the arguments adduced by Kurtz, Hengstenberg, Newton, and many others, in favor of its *Messianic character*.

Num. ch. 23, after announcing that Israel is held in special favor by God (owing to this Theocratic relationship,) so that he cannot curse them,

Balaam adds : v. 9. "*So, the people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations.*" *The Targum of Onkelos* : "*So! the people by themselves are to possess the world, and among the nations they shall not be judged with consumption.*" Dr. Kurtz (*His. of Old Cov.* vol. 3, p. 426) : "*Behold, it is a people dwelling apart, not reckoning itself among the heathen.*" This has direct reference to *the elect condition* of the nation, and which election we have shown continues and will yet be wonderfully manifested in *the special exaltation and supremacy* of the nation at the Second Advent, Props. 24, 68, 114, etc. To confine this *to* the past is taking but a *low* estimate of the elect position of the nation. Then follows v. 10 : "*Who can count the dust of Jacob and number the fourth part of Israel,*" or, as the *Targum of Onk.*, "*Who can number the dust of the house of Israel, of whom it is said, they shall increase as the dust of the earth*"—which evidently relates to that still future mighty increase when the Kingdom is restored. "*Let me die the death of the righteous and let my last end be like his,*" or as the *Targ. Onk.*—"*Let mine be the death of His truthful ones, and let my end be like theirs*" *—expressive of the exaltation awaiting those who die in faith and are raised up to the distinguishing Kingship and priesthood under the Messiah, or, of the supremacy and dominion in general, awaiting the nation under the Messiah in which the resurrected saints enjoy *a pre-eminence.* Then stating the reason why He must bless the nation, another is added, v. 21, "*He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath He seen perverseness in Israel: the Lord His God is with Him, and the shout of a King is among them,*" or as Kurtz : "*He beholdeth not iniquity in Jacob, and seeth no wrong in Israel; Jehovah His God is with Him and the shout of a King is in the midst of Him*"—that is, as freely predicted, God in His abundant mercy will forgive the past sinfulness of the nation, blot out its transgressions (comp. Micah 7 : 19, even the rejection and death of the Messiah), receive it to His favor as if it had not been guilty of sin, be specially present with it, and even manifest the Theocratic King in its midst. And this the more so, seeing that the righteous seed of Abraham together with the righteous King at the head, insures the blessings of the Most High. In v. 24, it is predicted : "*Behold the people shall rise up as a great lion* (or Kurtz, lioness) *and lift up himself as a young lion; he shall not lie down until he eat of the prey and drink the blood of the slain,*" and as repeated (ch. 24 : 8, 9) "*He hath as it were the strength of the unicorn; he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones and pierce them through* (or break) *with his arrows. He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion; who shall stir him up?*" This language reminds us of Jacob's prediction (Gen. 49 : 9) "*Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, thou art gone up; he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up?*" If the reader will refer to Props. 115, 123, 163, etc., he will find that this—however partially fulfilled in the past—is *a distinguishing characteristic* of the future. It is in view of this future overthrow of the enemies of God at the Sec. Advent, that the King Himself, in view of the important part assumed by Him, is designated "*The Lion of the tribe of Judah*"; *now* a Lamb but *then* a Lion because the executioner of delayed vengeance.

* The *Targum of Palestine* paraphrases : "If the house of Israel kill me with the sword, then it is made known to me, I shall have no portion in the world to come : nevertheless if I may but die the death of the true! O that my last end may be as the least among them." So also the *Jerusalem Targum* in substance.

Micah 5 : 4; Isa. 31 : 4, and other passages will be fulfilled on a scale that *woe betide* the people upon whom *this Lion* shall fall as a prey. Balaam describes the future honored position of the nation in the words ch. 24 : 5, etc. : "*How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel;*" (which the *Targ. Onk.* has : "*How goodly is thy land O Jacob, and the house of thy habitation, O Israel!*") "*As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the riverside, as the trees of lignaloes which the Lord hath planted and as cedar trees beside the waters.*" How this corresponds with the Millennial descriptions has already been sufficiently noticed. V. 7. "*He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters, and his king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted.*" We give other renderings : The *Targ. Onkelos* : "*The king anointed from his sons shall increase, and have dominion over many nations; his king shall be mightier than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted*"—Dr. Hales, following the *Sep.*—"*There shall come forth a man of his seed, and shall rule over many nations; and his king shall be higher than Gog, and his kingdom shall be exalted*"; Dr. Boothroyd : "*Water shall flow from the urn of Jacob, and his seed shall become as many waters; their king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom more highly exalted.*" All renderings are united in the main idea, viz. that the King over this nation shall be *above all other kings* (for, as Kurtz, *His. of Old Cov.* vol. p. 437, following Moses Gerundensis, p. 65 Newton *On Proph.*, shows Agag is a general or official name of all the kings), which at once recalls Ps. 89 : 27 "*I will make Him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth.*" His Kingdom is to be over all the earth. So Messianic was this regarded even by the Jews, that to this part of Balaam's prophecy the paraphrase was annexed (*Targ. Palestine*), "*The Word of the Lord their God is their help and the trumpets of the King Messiah resound among them,*" or (*Jerusalem Targ.*) "*The Word of the Lord is with them, and the trumpet of their glorious King protecteth them,*" or again (*Jerus. Targ.*) "*Their King will arise from among their children, and their Redeemer will be of them and among them; and he will gather their captives from the cities of their adversaries, and their children shall have rule among the peoples. And the Kingdom of the King Messiah shall be made great; stronger is He than Saul who vanquished Agag the King of Amalkaah*" (so *Targ. Onk.* "From them their King shall arise and their Redeemer be of them and among them, etc.) We now come to the most noted part in which Balaam says, "*I will advertise what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days,*" viz., verses 17–19—"*I shall see Him, but not now: I shall behold Him but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab* (marg. read.—smite through the princes of Moab), *and destroy all the children of Sheth* (marg. read.—Tumult). *And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for His enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come He that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city.*" *Targum Onkelos*: "*I see Him but not now; I behold Him but not nigh. When a King shall arise out of Jacob, and the Messiah be anointed from Israel, He will slay the princes of Moab, and reign over all the children of men. And Edom shall be an inheritance, and Seir a possession of His adversaries; but Israel shall prosper in riches. One will descend from the house of Jacob, who will destroy him that escapeth from the city of the*

peoples." Kurtz renders: "*I see Him, but not now; I behold Him, but not nigh. Out of Jacob goeth forth a Star, and out of Israel riseth up a Sceptre, and shattereth Moab right and left, and destroyeth all the sons of tumult. And Edom becometh His possession, and Seir becometh His possession, His enemies, and Israel doeth mighty things. A Ruler riseth out of Jacob, and He destroyeth what remaineth, out of the cities.*"[1] It is simply a matter of amazement that any one who professes to believe in the Word of God, should confine the fulfilment of this to Saul or to David, or even to the First Advent, seeing that later prophets, one after the other, take up the same prediction declaring the Coming of a mighty King who shall wonderfully destroy the enemies confederated against Him and obtain widespread dominion. It is *faithless to limit it*, as some do, when the identical coming, overthrow of foes (same word designative and descriptive of enemies being used), and reign is sung by David, reiterated by the prophets following down to Malachi, then taken up by the apostles, and finally specially revealed in the last Revelation. Hengstenberg well observes that "the star is so natural an image and symbol of the greatness and splendor of a ruler, that nearly all nations have employed it;" and Kurtz justly adds: "The star out of Jacob evidently denotes the Israelitish monarch *in its highest personal culmination*, which was in the person of the Messiah," and that this was so understood by the Jews appears from the Targums, etc. Eben Ezra (as quoted by Dr. Etheridge in Targums) says that many Hebrew commentators agree in explaining it of the Messiah. (We give one by way of illustration: Rabbi Moses ben Maimon remarks: "'Destroy all the children of Sheth.' *This is the King Messiah* of whom it is written, Ps. 72 : 8, "He shall have dominion from sea to sea.'") How widely this idea was extended is evident from the pretended Messiah, Barkokab, who, in Hadrian's reign, derived his prestige from the fact that his name, "*the son of the star*," was supposed to be a fulfilment of this prediction. Jesus justly claims to be the Star, and conjoins with it the additional fact that He is "*the Morning Star*," which ushers in the morning of the glorious day of the Lord Jesus, thus Himself linking it with His future revelation. Indeed, owing to the sinfulness of the Jewish nation, the fulfilment was *postponed* from the First to the Second Advent, when He comes to smite His enemies and establish the covenanted Kingdom. This will be *a terrible time* to the wicked, and hence Balaam adds, v. 23, "*Alas! who shall live when God doeth this?*" which the *Targ. of Onk.* renders: "*Woe to the wicked who may live when God doeth this!*" the *Targum of Palestine*: "*Woe to them who are alive at the time the Word of the Lord shall be revealed, to give the good reward to the righteous, and to take vengeance on the wicked, to smite the nations and the kings, and bring these things upon them!*" and the *Jerus. Targum*: "*Woe to him who is alive when the Word of the Lord setteth Himself to give the good reward to the just and to take vengeance on the wicked!*" How fearful, can be seen by glancing over the description of it given by Malachi (ch. 4), or Revelation (ch. 19), and numerous confirmatory prophecies, when He who is the Word of God, the King of kings, comes to save His own people and to utterly confound all His enemies.[2] Balaam's prediction, coming when *the first confederation* arises against the Theocracy, directs the eye of faith onward to the time when *the last great confederation* shall be broken by the Theocratic King.

[1] *Targum of Palestine:* "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but it is not

near. When the mighty King of Jacob's house shall reign, and the Messiah, the Power-Sceptre of Israel, be anointed, He will slay the princes of Moabaee, and bring to nothing all the children of Sheth, the armies of Gog who will do battle against Israel, and all the carcasses shall fall before Him. And the Edomaee will be utterly driven out, even the sons of Gabela from before Israel their foes, and Israel will be strengthened with their riches and possess them. And a Prince of the house of Jacob will arise and destroy and consume the remnant that have escaped from Constantina the guilty city, and will lay waste and ruin the rebellious city, even Kaiserin, the strong city of the Gentiles." *Jerusalem Targum:* "I shall see Him, but not now; I shall behold Him, but He is not nigh. A King is to arise from the house of Jacob, and a Redeemer and Ruler from the house of Israel, who will slay the strong ones of the Moabaee, and bring to nothing, and consume all the children of the East. And Edom may inherit Mount Gabela from their enemies, but Israel will be stronger with a mighty host. A King will arise from the house of Jacob and destroy what shall remain of the strong city."

[2] For the sake of those who are interested in the things pertaining to the last times, we append a few additional extracts from the Targums upon the difficult concluding portion of Balaam's prophecy, which show that they were interpreted as relating to the future, and to the times of the Messiah. Thus e.g. on verse 20, the *Targum of Palestine:* "The first of the nations who made war with the house of Israel were those of the house of Amalek; and they at last in the days of the King Messiah, with all the children of the East, will make war against Israel; but all of them will have eternal destruction in their end." *Jerusalem Targum:* "The house of Amalek was the first of the peoples to make war with Israel, and at the last, in the end of the days, they will array battle against them; but their end is to perish and their destruction to be forever." On verses 21, 22, 23, the *Targum of Palestine:* "How strong is thy habitation, who hast set thy dwelling-place in the clefts of the rocks! Yet so is it decreed that the children of Shalmaia must be despoiled, but not until Sancherib the King of Athur shall come and make them captive." *Jerus. Targum:* "How strong is thy abode, who hast set the house of thy dwelling in the clefts of the rock! But the Shalmaia will not be spoiled until Athuria shall arise and take the captive." *Targum of Pales.:* "Woe to them," etc., already quoted, then follows: "And ships (lit. sails) armed for war will come forth with great armies from Lombarina and from the land of Italia (Vulgate: Venient in trieribus de Italia) conjoined with the legions that will come from Constantina and will afflict the Atheniaee, and bring into captivity the sons of Eber (comp. *Peschito:* and subjugate all the Hebrews), nevertheless the end of these and of those is to fall by the hand of the King Messiah and be brought to everlasting destruction." *Jerus. Targum:* "Woe," etc., then adds: "And great hosts in Livernia will come from the great city and will conjoin with them many legions of the Romanee and subjugate Athuria and afflict all the children beyond the river. Nevertheless the end of these and of those is to perish and the destruction to be everlasting." *Targ. Onkelos* on same verses: "Strong is the house of thy dwelling, and in a strong fortress hast thou set thy abode; but yet Shalmaah shall be destroyed, for Athuria will make thee captive." "Woe," etc., then follows: "And ships will come from the Kittaee (comp. Syriac: "And the legions shall come forth from the land of the Kittoyee") and afflict Athur, and subdue beyond the Phrat; but they also shall perish forever."

Obs. 6. This doctrine of the Kingdom confirms the already overpowering reasons given for the retention and inspiration of *the later prophecies of Isaiah,* seeing that they form a *consistent outgrowth* of covenant and promise, incorporating precisely that which is requisite to carry out the Theocratic ordering in the Redemption of the world. It also maintains *the integrity of Daniel* in this respect, showing how his prophecies stand *consistently related* with all others pertaining to the Kingdom, and to a constant and even present fulfilment establishing historically its inspiration. It confirms the force and propriety of many of *the ancient Messianic promises,* which modern Jews and destructive criticism would apply to something else. It aids in ascertaining *the meaning of words* (i. e. when several meanings are presented, by applying analogy in connection with the other tests), in interpreting *the figurative and symbolical* language, in applying some of *the types,* and in reconciling *apparent contradictions.* In brief,

it is the testimony of every one who has given this subject any careful study, that it is such "*a solvent of difficulties*" that its application has given great joy of heart and delighted surprise in discovering the import of passages which otherwise proved either to be unsatisfactory or dark. Among many others, Riley, in *The Restoration*, makes this confession, and proceeds to show how our doctrine removes difficulties, as in the promises of inheriting and possessing the earth, in the parables, in the resurrection, in the renewal of creation, in the scene described by Matt. 25 : 31–46 (viz., in the ground of approval and of condemnation—for instead of the heart, the motives being examined, external, outward deeds are considered, etc.), in watching for the Advent, and in the wonderful results of Redemption, culminating in the salvation of the race as a race. But these and other points having been duly considered under their proper heading no more need be added.

We append, however, a few illustrations. Thus e.g. it suggests that if we are authorized to accept of "Alamoth" of Ps. 45 to denote (so many critics) "virgins, or hidden ones, or hid things," how to appropriate and apply the same. Again : if we are permitted to receive the correction of critics made in the clause (Ps. 93 : 2), "Thy throne is established *of old*," by substituting "Thy throne is established from then" (or as Luther : "Von dem an stehet dein Stuhl vest"), we have not only the Messianic reign described, but the perpetuity of the same asserted. Again : in view of the striking language of Isa. 41, so applicable to the Messiah, we can adopt Fausset's (*Com. loci*) suggestion that the chapter makes a typical fulfilment in Cyrus, but a complete one in Jesus, the Messiah. Again : a deeper significancy and depth is given to promises, which are generally regarded as fulfilled in the past. Thus e.g. take Noah's prophecy (Gen. 9 : 25–27), and while it had a striking fulfilment in the past (comp. Bh. Newton's *Diss. on Proph.*, Diss. 1), yet it will continue to be still more strikingly fulfilled in the future Kingdom. While the curse is being, by degrees, removed, the distinction predicted will still remain. Thus to illustrate : (1) God in the Person of Jesus, the Christ, "shall dwell in the tents of Shem," and this is done when He enters upon His inheritance ; (2) Japheth shall be enlarged, which is done in the perpetuation of the race (Prop. 152) ; (3) the descendants of Ham and Canaan shall acknowledge the supremacy of Shem (Prop. 114). Even Ps. 29, which is usually applied to a poetical description of a thunder-storm when applied to this future period becomes more intensely expressive. This "voice of the Lord" (so called because instituted and directed by Him, and proclaiming His power), ridiculed by unbelieving science, will again be heard so expressively and terrifically that unbelief will quail before its dreadful sound—even the boldest and most bloody of sinners will have their guilty consciences aroused by it. For, let it be observed, however in some places it may have a symbolic import, yet the repeated mention of it, its use in deliverance (e.g. Ex. 9 : 23, 29, 33), in inauguration of the Theocracy (Ex. 19 : 16 and 20 : 18), in the Theocratic King employing it against enemies (as e.g. 1 Sam. 7 : 10), in attestation of Theocratic rule (1 Sam. 12 : 17, 18), indicates that this agency, so impressive, will again be employed (2 Sam. 22 : 14 ; Ps. 77 : 18 ; Ps. 18 : 13 ; Isa. 29 : 6, etc.).

Obs. 7. This doctrine also aids in our understanding *the allusions and language* of the early Fathers of the Church. If it is requisite, in order to understand any author, to enter into his spirit and to comprehend the reasoning which leads him to definite conclusions, this is equally true of the primitive writers. Without a knowledge of the Covenant promises, the prophecies based upon them, etc., it is simply impossible to do justice to certain expressions and even doctrinal positions assumed by the Fathers.

A recent case of misunderstanding will illustrate our meaning. Thus Froude (*Short Studies*, p. 223) adduces a passage from Clement (adopted by him) in order to invalidate his credibility and to make himself merry at Clement's expense. "The most strange words" which "*no hypothesis will explain*," are the following : "The Lord being asked when His Kingdom should come, said : 'When *two* shall be *one*, and that which is *without*

as that which is *within*, and the male with the female *neither* male nor female.' " This enigmatical, and to Froude nonsensical, expression is not so inexplicable as he imagines, if we only keep in view *Clement's belief in the Kingdom.* It is susceptible, according to the things pertaining to the Kingdom, of a rational explanation. Thus, e.g. the Kingdom comes after (as we have shown, Props. 125–129) the first resurrection and male and female (i.e. the distinctive sexual organization) is swallowed up in the glorified form as even Jesus intimates, Luke 20 : 34–36. Again the two being made one may refer to several things, such as the reunion (separated by death) of soul and body, the two kingdoms united as the prophets predict, the world reconciled to God, the Jew and Gentile united in Kingdom, etc. While the meaning to be attached to the without being made or becoming like that within is found either in the glorification of the body, or the marriage of the saints with Christ, or the promised unity and rulership, or the extension of the Theocratic relationship from the Jews—the elect—over all nations, etc. The promises pertaining to the Kingdom, if accepted, do not make the language of Clement unreasonable or the proper subject of ridicule ; at least they give him credit for honesty and consistent belief, so that he is not chargeable with endeavoring to break down a faith without being able to substitute a better one.

PROPOSITION 193. *This doctrine of the Kingdom meets, and consistently removes, the objections brought against Christianity by the Jews.*

This is a wide field, and we can only briefly point out how, from our standpoint, *a consistent answer* can be given to the objections urged by Jewish unbelief against the reception of Jesus Christ.

Obs. 1. The student, if observant, must have noticed a remarkable feature in the history of this nation, viz., that immediately and some time after the First Advent many Jews were converted to Christianity, forming even churches composed almost entirely of them. The history of the first and second centuries shows that it was nothing *unusual* for Jews to embrace Jesus Christ as *the promised Messiah*. But gradually such conversions became rarer, until they either entirely ceased or formed exceptionable cases. If we inquire into the causes of this change, it will be found that it resulted almost entirely in *the departure* of the large body of the Church from the Millenarian ground occupied by the early Church. The Origenistic, Augustinian, and succeeding theology discarded what was pronounced to be "*the Jewish*" element, and engrafted another, the Gentile, into its place. The result was seen in its contracting Jewish conversions and in its confirming Jewish unbelief. On the other hand, a return to the theology of the early Church invites the conversion of the Jews, seeing that it materially aids in removing the principal objections which hold them in unbelief.

The Jews, as the Messianic idea of the Kingdom was lost sight of and the prophecies were spiritualized, became less and less accessible. They were then met rather with invectives than arguments. This is illustrated even by the titles of treatises, as e.g. Agobard's *De Insolentia Judæorum, De Judaic Superstitionibus,* or Martini's *Capistrum Judæorum,* or *the Halter or Muzzle of the Jews,* etc. How much injury the self-conceit and pride of Gentileism has inflicted it is impossible to calculate. The position of the Jew was beyond description painful and trying ; on the one hand under the cloud of God's withdrawal and displeasure, and suffering the prophetic announcements of punishment, and then, on the other hand, having a Messianic Kingdom urged upon them by those in power *contradictory* to covenant and prophecy. Need we wonder that at times they almost despaired, and that some should yield up faith and hope? Need we be surprised that a Jew, Maimonides, should be regarded by many as the Father of Rationalistic Theology, when, brooding under the persecution of centuries and the rejection of the promises made to his nation by professed Christianity, he should endeavor to remove, as much as possible, the Supernatural from the Old Test.? The wonder is that so many Jews still hold to the Messianic idea and to God's covenanted promises. It is a sad commentary on human nature that prominent men in the Church (as e.g. Cyril, see Gibbon's *His.*, vol. 4, p. 501) persecuted the Jews instead of striving to win them by kindness and truth. It is gratifying that a strong reaction has set in, and that not merely toleration is accorded, but a deep interest is felt in their welfare, evidenced by special societies organized in their behalf.

Owing to our Pre-Millenarian views, the Jews are more accessible, as evidenced by the conversions of Jews, and the numerous Jewish Pre-Millenarian

writers in Europe and this country. Lederer, formerly editor of the *Israelite Indeed* (vol. 8, p. 82), and a missionary among the Jews, after delineating our doctrine as particularly adapted to reach the Jews, declares that "Indeed, by the preaching of a full Gospel to the Jews, there have been more Jews converted in the last twenty-five years, than during seventeen centuries of the Christian era. All converted Jews, therefore, with but few exceptions, are Pre-Millenarians." Our most bitter opponents concede that converted Jews are almost exclusively Millenarian. Thus e.g. the author of *God is Love* (Pref. vol. 3) candidly says: "It must afford some satisfaction to Millenarians to find that *all* the Jews who embrace the religion of Jesus (there are many such in England) do become zealous supporters of the theory of our Lord's personal reign on earth." We acknowledge, gratefully, the "satisfaction" that this affords. The Gospel still remains a stumbling-block to the Jews, arising chiefly from the crucifixion of Jesus, but this is greatly increased by the peculiar Messianic ideas engrafted upon the same. We need not apprehend the spirit of Ambrose, Justinian, Ferdinand and Isabella, Agobard, or Torquemada toward the Jews, for an enlightened Christian sentiment abjures such, but we have reason to deprecate the Messianic views, so current, which the Jew finds *utterly irreconcilable* with the Old Test. statements. It was difficult even in the primitive Church, with the aid of the conciliating Pre-Millenarian views, to reach the Jews (as e.g. evidenced by the persecutions excited by them against Christianity, and by the testimony of Justin Martyr—see *Apol.*, l. 2, f. 83, and Neander's *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 63), but this difficulty is seriously enhanced by the rejection of this conciliating element. We call the attention of the student to Dr. Neander's (*Genl. Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 423) important observation. After referring to Justin's omission of Chiliasm in his Apologies, and to his introduction of the same into the *Dial. with Trypho* the Jew, he says: "On the contrary, in a dialogue designed to vindicate the Christian doctrine against the objections of the Jews, he had special reason to give prominence to this point, in order to show that the Christians *were orthodox* in this particular, even according to the Jewish notions."

Some doubt the Jewish conversions reported. So e.g. Dr. Spring reports (art. "General Assembly" in *Princeton Review*, July, 1853, p. 466) very few converted through the instrumentality of "the Jews' Society of London." But Dr. Baird, on the other hand, testified to such conversions, and to "great success," being himself personally acquainted with missionaries and many converts. The *Luth. Observer* (Aug. 2d, 1878) states that "in 1809, when the London Soc. for Promoting Christianity among the Jews was founded, it is said that the most diligent search would only discover thirty-five Christian Hebrews in the whole of England. Since then more than twenty thousand have embraced the faith, and been baptized. *Harper's Weekly* (March 16th, 1878) reports, from statements made by the *English Independent*, that there are between fifty and sixty thousand Jewish Christians in Great Britain, of whom *one hundred and thirty* are clergymen of the Established Church. The *Southern Churchman* (quoted in *Luth. Observer*, Aug. 30th, 1878) "declares that there have been, since 1815, more than one hundred clergymen of the Church of England, including two bishops, who were converted Jews; and in one English chapel, in the same period, there have been seven hundred and eighty adult Jews, and six hundred and five children, converted and baptized." The Bishop of Ripon (quoted in *Proph. Times*, vol. 5, p. 89) says: "In London alone there are now three thousand converted Israelites. The London Jews' Society can tell of twenty thousand converts, of whom it is assumed that they are members of the invisible as well as of the visible Church of Christ. More than one hundred ordained clergymen, originally members of the Jewish communion, but now converted to the faith of Christ, are preaching the Gospel." Such testimonies, which might be extended to other countries, speak for themselves. In the art. "Poland, Mission among the Jews in" (M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) it is said that before the Jewish Mission in Poland was broken up by the government (owing to the war with England—the mission being planted and supported by Englishmen), it had baptized quite a number of Jews (in the year 1851 there were three hundred and twenty-six baptized), but the missionaries had to leave Jan., 1855. After a suspension of twenty years, the mission was resumed in 1877, by permission of the Emperor. The Jews issued there excommunication against those who would have any intercourse with the missionaries. Many Bibles, Testaments, and Tracts were also circulated. Some of the converts, it is said, occupy "the highest stations in life," being persons of prominence and ability. The *Ch. Herald* (Aug. 21st, 1879) reports that a colony of Jews at Hamadan, in Persia, has been agitated by the question, "Is not Jesus the Messiah?" Four of the chief men, the heads of one thousand houses (about five thousand people) have, after long trial, been publicly baptized, and others are asking to confess Christ. A number of

conversions, chiefly through Jewish missionaries, have taken place in this country, and hold a membership in various denominations.

Obs. 2. The principle of interpretation adopted by us, especially in reference to the prophecies, at once *commends* itself to the Jew. We do not, dare not, *divide* the prophecies, which describe *one connected series* of events, by the introduction of a new and most arbitrary mode of interpretation, which is not indicated in the text. Thus e. g. take the predictions relating to the Jewish nation, and interpret the one part referring to its tribulation, desolation, etc., *literally*, and then, when the prophecies go on without any sign of a change to speak of the same nation, proceed to spiritualize the rest and apply it to us Gentiles, we do a violence to the text and manifest injustice to the nation of whom the things are specially predicted. And yet, rejecting the interpretation of the early Church, which logically held these prophecies to be continuous in their relation to the same people, this has been *the very posture* of the Church, with here and there an honorable exception, for many long, long centuries. To such an extent has this been carried that it is almost a proverb that curses belong to the Jews and blessings to the Gentiles. It is needless to say how such an interpretation would *necessarily affect* a Jew; for he, with the Old. Test. in his hands, however much he may overlook the predictions of a suffering Messiah, still clings to the triumphant Messianic predictions *with which, if there is any meaning in language, his nation is connected.* The Orthodox Jews confess the sovereignty of God, admit that through sinfulness (not that, however, of rejecting Jesus) they have been cast out, etc., and, realizing in their past history the sad truthfulness and reality of prophetic announcements, *still fondly anticipate* a further fulfilment of the same Word—now finding its mate in their condition—in the removal of the curse and the bestowment of blessing. The Reformed or Rationalistic class, having given up the hope of a Messiah as predicted (in fact discarding almost everything but a belief in God and His unity), are also utterly unprepared, owing to *the spiritualizing away* of the predictions pertaining to their nation, to give credit to the system of Christianity. Eagerly availing themselves of the criticisms of Strauss, Bauer, Renan, etc., they triumphantly point to the prophecies, to the early Church doctrine, and then to the immensely *transformed* view now so generally entertained by the Church, and claim, justly too, that if the fulfilment attributed to those prophecies exhaust them in the way believed, *then* there is a gross violation of language, etc. Both Orthodox and Rationalistic deem the principle of interpretation thus upheld *irrelevant and untrustworthy*, making the Old. Test. to predict on its plain surface what shall *never* be realized *in the form* announced. The Jew, however, cannot object to our system of interpretation, charging it with *inconsistency*, seeing that we apply the prophecies pertaining to their nation *continuously;* not only receiving the temporary rejection, the punishment inflicted, but *also fully admitting* the importance of the nation, its near (Theocratic) relation to God, and its ultimate restoration and triumph *just as the grammatical sense predicts.*

The *Press* (quoted *Proph. Times*, June, 1877) remarks: "Rabbi Marks, of London, in a sermon, says the Jews reject Jesus Christ as the Messiah, because 'of the three distinctive facts which the inspired seer of Judah *inseparably connects* with the Advent of the Messiah, viz., the cessation of war and the uninterrupted reign of peace, the prevalence of a perfect concord of opinion on all matters bearing upon the worship of the one and

only God, and the gathering of the remnant of Judah and of the tribes of Israel'—not one of these prophecies has yet been fulfilled." Now our system of interpretation cordially receives these three characteristics *as plainly taught* and connected with the Advent of the Messiah. We just as fully as the Jew believe that they will yet be realized *just as predicted.* And this confirms us the more in the Messiahship of the crucified Jesus, because (1) all these "distinctive facts" are attributed to His Second Advent; (2) the reasons why they were not realized at the First Advent are fully given in the non-repentance of the nation, its rejection of the Christ, as shown in both the Old and the New Testaments; (3) the First Advent with its results, confirmed by a continuous fulfilment of prediction and promise down to the present, confirms the ability of this Jesus to fulfil the covenants and prophecies at the specified Advent; (4) but we do not confine ourselves to these "three distinctive facts," but compare and receive *all* the prophecies relating to the Messiah. Doing this, we find one class referring to the humiliation, rejection, suffering, and death of the Messiah verified in Jesus, and this only immeasurably confirms our faith in Him and that ultimately, as promised, *all the Scriptures* will be realized in and through Him. Thus that which forms an objection to the Jewish mind by only receiving *a part* of God's Word, becomes to us, when believing *the whole* Word, a tower of strength.

Obs. 2. The doctrine of election, as held by us, removes Jewish prejudice. The Jew finds in the Old Test. a clear announcement of *the elect condition* of the Jewish nation, and its election *practically confirmed* by the Theocratic and Theocratic-Davidic arrangement. He reads, that, however much the nation may be punished for its sinfulness, and however individuals of the nation may forfeit blessings coming through this election, yet *God will never utterly forsake it;* but will, when the time has arrived, show *His own faithfulness* to Covenanted promises, *His respect* to His own election, and reinstate them in a position by which *the election is fully vindicated.* He even points to *the oath of God* as confirmatory of all this, and, resting in *the most solemnly pledged Word of God*, rejects the anti-scriptural views largely incorporated with professing Christianity, and with them, wrongfully supposing them to be part of it, Christianity itself. The notion that the nation has forfeited its election, which is now simply conferred on individuals, chiefly Gentiles who remain such, is a stumbling-block in the way of the Jew. Our doctrine entirely meets his objections, seeing that we *cordially acknowledge this Jewish election;* that we insist upon it that notwithstanding their temporary cast-off condition, and their blindness, yet "as concerning the Gospel, they are enemies for your sakes, *but as touching the election they are beloved for the fathers' sakes*, Rom. 11 : 28; that we distinctly prove, that, owing to this very election, the Gentiles, in order to participate in the promises *covenanted to the Jews*, must be *grafted in, adopted as part of the elect nation*, virtually becoming the seed of Abraham and thus inherit the promises with Abraham; and that, when this incorporation of Gentiles (produced by Jewish defection) has been sufficiently carried out to raise up a seed unto Abraham (for Theocratic purposes) *then will the elect Jewish nation* be restored to its *covenanted* Theocratic-Davidic relation, *thus vindicating and establishing* its election before all nations. (Comp. e.g. Props. 24, 57, 61, 63, 111, 112, etc.

It is sad to find Jews deliberately receiving the Rationalistic interpretations of the Old Test. and incorporating them in a regular commentary. Thus Kalisch in his *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Test.*, rejects the Messianic predictions or promises of Genesis, etc. (making the Messianic conception to originate with the prophets) and thus vitiates the noble covenanted election and unity, which is, correctly appreciated, *the glory* of the Jewish nation. From this elect position of the nation, it is impossible to separate the Messianic idea. Alas! how true it is to-day of many a Jew, that—as Dorner remarked of Philo—the Messianic idea has become in him a burnt-out cinder, of which only the ashes are left. Will such only consider how the New Test. retains the idea of

the nation's continued election and its ultimate glorious result, and in view of this special honoring of the nation ask, with unprejudiced minds, why this retention and its inseparable connection with a pure Theocratic, Messianic conception?

The Reformed Jews (art. "Messiah" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) in 1840, at Frankfort, declared that 'a Messiah who is to lead back to Palestine is *neither expected nor desired* by the associated, and that they acknowledge that alone to be their country to which they belong by birth or civil relation." In 1869 at a meeting held in Leipsic, the following resolution was passed, rejecting Jewish restoration: "Those portions of our prayers which refer to the re-establishment of the annual sacrifices at the Messianic period, or to the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, must be modified." The London *Jewish Chronicle*, a conservative journal standing between the Orthodox and the Reformed parties, says: "Although every Jew is bound to believe in a Messiah, the question whether that expression indicates a person or a time, and whether he or it has arrived or not, is, according to the Talmud an open question." The Messiah, then, may be a personage, or a conjunction of events producing moral power, or a period of regeneration, or the Jewish nation itself as a regenerator. The liberal and reformed Jews of this country present similar declarations in their journals. They, of course, reject the plain grammatical sense (thus far so notably fulfilled in their nation, etc.) of prophecy, and with it the grand future portrayed of their nation under David's Son in a restored Theocracy. On the other hand, the Orthodox Jews cleave to the prophecies and the Messianic idea and Kingdom. While many Jews cordially receive Renan's *Life of Jesus* (and similar works) and eulogize it, there are others who condemn it (and similar) as utterly unfair and untrustworthy. Thus e.g. Prof. Stowe in the *Books of the Bible* (p. 284) quotes a Jewish Rabbi, Dr. Philippson, of Magdeburg, who pronounces Renan "no critic; he is merely a rationalist," and says, that his work can "gain no great importance in the domain of science and historical criticism, for, after all, much of the work rests upon arbitrary assumptions," etc. Surely this ought to be the view of Jews *who respect* the Old Test. and their own nation, when they find the same degraded by an uncritical attack upon Jesus. As to Jesus Himself, we can only say, that when Moses Mendelssohn wrote (see art. on him in M'Clin. and Strong's *Cyclop.*) to Lavater expressing his "veneration for the moral character of the founder of Christianity," we may well pass by the declarations of inferior minds.

Obs. 3. Our doctrine has no sympathy with the destructive criticism, which even believers in their apologies present—that, on the ground of "Jewish prejudices," "Jewish ideas," etc.—rejects some portions of the Gospels or Epistles or Apocalypse. This has an unhappy influence upon the Jews, as is evinced by their adopting it so largely and asking the question proposed by Levi (*Letters to Dr. Priestly*, p. 82), *How are we sure that the remainder is authentic?*" While it is a matter of surprise that Jews should accept of the results of a criticism based *on prejudice* against their ancestors (i. e. their views), yet they avail themselves of it as a retaliation against the system of Christianity which generally indorses the same prejudice. The doctrine defended by us has *no need* of such mutilation of the Word to accommodate it to modern notions of the fitness of things, and *certainly not* when derived from antipathy to Jewish views. It does *not* cast contempt upon the faith of ancient and pious Jews who were satisfied with the literal, grammatical sense; it does *not* denounce such as in error or in holding to a "materialistic husk" utterly unworthy of modern reception; it does *not* reflect on the intelligence of prophet and people, who believed in covenants and promises just as they were given; it does *not* set itself up in direct antagonism to "Jewish conceptions," and denounce them as so "carnal" as to be unfit for our enlightened age; but it receives the Word just as prophet and people did, as Jews who are represented as specially favored by God did, as Jews who were preachers of the promises did, and finds no necessity existing to decry, in order to establish itself, God's ancient people, making them to live in darkness and entertaining a vain faith and hope. Surely *the manner* in which our doctrine manifests such high

respect for the intelligent piety of these ancient worthies, indicates the wisdom and logical accurateness of their expectations, preserves and elevates the character of their faith and hope, and does this all on *a true scriptural basis*—this ought, in the nature of the case, to find *more favor* with the Jew than those theories which *degrade* his forefathers, while under direct teaching from heaven, into believers of fables. Admitting the idle tradition existing in the nation obtained by adding largely to the Word, yet so far as the Covenants, both Abrahamic and Davidic are concerned, there was *an undoubted correct apprehension* entertained concerning them by the nation at large, and especially by the Jews mentioned in the Scriptures. This is seen by *the general belief* on the subject, and which was *perpetuated* in the first Christian churches, *uncontradicted* by its founders. Thus, instead of mutilating Scripture under the plea of their being "too Jewish," we find this very element a most powerful and indispensable argument *in favor* of their inspiration. Hence this feature should commend itself to every Jew, who feels that his national connection is worthy of defence, that his ancestors were not a set of blind, deluded believers; and, instead of arraying himself (as many now do) on the side of those who are engaged in the work of lowering and degrading his noble and eminent forefathers, he should rather be inclined to those who show forth the praises due to an expectant, believing people as found in the Scriptures, even if it does include the testimony of the New Test. in its entirety.

Let prejudice, so unfavorable to investigation and truth, be laid aside, and allow the just claims of Judaism and of Christianity to be presented. Having given under various Propositions certain doctrines of Judaism retained by Christianity, and for which Christianity is preparing a perfect realization, let us under this one urge the claims that Christianity has to the respectful attention of the Jew. As preliminary, a few points may be introduced. (1) It certainly is eminently worthy of the candid Jew to notice how largely the Jewish nation *is indebted to Jesus* for the large and increasing respect which the nation has attained. Benj. Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield) in his *Life of Lord Bentick*, refers to this feature, of which we only give the opening sentences, as follows: "Perhaps, too, in this enlightened age, as his mind expands and he takes a comprehensive view of this period of progress, the pupil of Moses may ask himself whether all the princes of the house of David have done so much for the Jews as that Prince who was crucified on Calvary. Had it not been for Him the Jews would have been comparatively unknown, or known only as a high Oriental caste which had lost its country. Has not He made their history the most famous history in the world?" etc. The hate and mutual animosities of the past centuries have given place to a better feeling and understanding, and Jesus of Nazareth and His teachings have inspired a regard for the nation that ought to be recognized and, may we add, reciprocated. (2) The Jews, with their intense devotion to the prophecies, and their earnest desire for deliverance under persecution, were frequently imposed on by False Messiahs (see articles on, in various Bib. dictionaries and cyclopædias which give lists of them as they appeared in the various centuries), producing great misery to individuals and the nation. Now not one of these came in the way designated by the prophecies, and this imposition might all have been avoided if the scriptural representations of the manner of the Messiah's Coming had been observed. The First Advent of Jesus is so remarkable that it should urge the Jew to compare it with the Old Test. in order to see for himself whether the manner and events connected therewith are *in correspondence* with prediction. Without such a comparison carefully instituted the Jew is inexcusable; with it, we have no fears of the result, as evidenced in the past history of eminent and learned men among them. Simpson (*Plea for Religion*) makes the prophecies of the Old Test. to be fulfilled in Christ, literally in one hundred and nine instances; Horne (*Introd.*, vol. 1, pp. 126 and 451), and many others, produce a wonderful array of literal fulfilment as to (1) descent, (2) time of Coming and forerunner, (3) place of birth, (4) particulars of birth, (5) life and qualifications, (6) miracles, (7) special events, (8) rejection and sufferings, (9) death, (10) burial, (11) resurrection and exaltation. These embrace an astounding array of minute particulars, so that we can readily

see how (Acts 18 :28) "*the Apostles mightily convinced the Jews shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ*" in a reference to them, confirmed as they were by their personal witnessing of them. The Jew certainly, in view of the high interests involved, should dispassionately consider an array of testimony which has so largely influenced the most cultivated of intellects of the Gentile world to accept of the Jew Jesus as the very Messiah predicted by their own Jewish Scriptures. No impostor could possibly have thus far fulfilled the Old Test., seeing that in the predictions and fulfilments there are involved things beyond the power of mortal man to verify. Only one being has thus far appeared, in whom the Messianic prophecies have a determined and noble fulfilment, and that one is Jesus in whom so many Gentiles hopefully and lovingly trust. This very fact should lead the Jew to a renewed and impartial examination. (3) The Jews, in order to reconcile the statements of the prophets respecting the Messiah, resort (see articles "Messiah," "Jews," etc., in our encyclopædias, etc.) to a twofold Messiah, one in a state of poverty and suffering, the other in a state of splendor and glory. They thus make two persons and two Messiahs, whereas the Old Test. speaks only of one Messiah, as covenanted and predicted, viz., that glorious David's Son who shall restore the Theocracy. How are these Scriptures to be reconciled? By arbitrarily and violently making two Messiahs, or by making two Advents, the one in humiliation, etc., and the other in triumph and glory? Let the Jew consider the reasonableness and consistency of Christianity in bringing forth this twofold prediction and fully reconcile it by applying it to the same person (as the prophets do) under two Advents—the one literally fulfilled in a hundred particulars, the other remaining postponed, and this postponement *being confirmed* by the prophets and the predictions of the Messiah. This position occupied by the believer in Jesus is worthy of special attention, seeing that he thus accepts of *the one Messiah* covenanted and promised, in whom all that the prophets have spoken admirably finds its mate, making the suffering Messiah, as God's Word does, the ultimate triumphant one who fulfils covenant and prophecy. (4) We earnestly request, as a preparatory act, the unbelieving Jew to consider that the Old Test. predicts *the rejection* of the Messiah by the nation as evidenced by the predictions (as e.g. Ps. 118 : 22), "the stone which the builders refused," etc.), and by the subsequent repentance of the nation (as e.g. Zech. 12 : 9-14, etc.) which is based on a previous rejection. That the Messiah should become "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" has been sadly verified by a most painful experience ; that the repentance and subsequent exaltation will likewise be experienced *the same prophets declare.* Will the Jew honestly ponder the reasons assigned for such a stumbling, and then in this connection reflect upon the calling of the Gentiles and their adoption as believers when their own people should suffer, for a time appointed, the withdrawal of God's special favor, which even Moses predicted (Deut. 32 : 21). The wonderful fulfilment thus far and the astonishing reception of the Messiah spurned by the nation, should awaken deep attention. (5) Again, will the Jew accept of the statements of his own Scriptures that the Messiah was to come while the temple was still standing within the weeks designated by Daniel (9 : 24-27) ; if so, who but Jesus of Nazareth came within the stipulated time and place? Surely the variety and converging testimony should awaken the Jewish mind and heart to dispassionately consider the claims of that Jesus, who, in the most remarkable manner, possesses all the requisite marks of a true Messiah. It will not answer to make out, as many Jews do, that "Daniel was no prophet" (so e.g. Dr. Wise, editor of the *Amer. Israelite*, May 30th, 1879), because we have too much evidence how Daniel was estimated and understood previous to the Advent of Jesus, which is confirmed by the statements of the Gospels (e.g. in quoting from him and the manner in which it was received by the High-priest). A fair reading of works on Daniel, as Hengstenberg's, Hävernick, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Kliefoth, etc., as well as an unbiassed consideration of the historical fulfilment thus far of his predictions, clearly and unmistakably show that, while "not a prophet by virtue of his office, yet, like David and Solomon, he possessed the gift of prophecy" (so Delitzsch, etc.). (6) Will the Jew honestly consider that to avoid the Christian application of suffering and humiliation to Jesus, as predicted, many—rejecting the older applications—withdraw such a Messiah entirely from the Messianic prediction, declaring that all such passages (as e.g. the celebrated Isa. 53) relate to some other person, or to the nation itself. Why this contradiction to earlier expositions and to later ones (see art. "Messiah" in Herzog's *Cyclop.*) unless it be simply to repel Christian argument? Auberlen (*Div. Rev.*, p. 83) remarks that Jews, when Isa. 53 was read to them by missionaries, passionately asserted that it could not be in the Old Test., but was interpolated by Christians, so strikingly and convincingly was the impression made by its mere reading. The variations and shifts (see art. "Prophet" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) to which men give play

when endeavoring to make Isa. 53 (and similar predictions, as Ps. 22 : 16 ; Ps. 42, 43, 69, 72, 110 ; Zech. 12 : 10, etc.) un-Messianic, are largely the result of prejudice and hostility. (7) Can a Jew be induced to cut himself loose from the most powerful leverage constructed by Jewish ingenuity against the reception of Jesus as the Messiah, viz., the Talmudical system? About the third century the Mishna or Second Law was compiled from legendary tradition, to which afterward were added the Gamara of Jerusalem and the Gemara of Babylon, and these being appended to the laws of Moses so prejudiced the Jews against Jesus and His recognition that it was scarcely possible to induce them to consider the subject. (Comp. arts, on these in Cyclops., etc.) We allow a Jew to speak on this point. Felix Adler in an art. on "Reformed Judaism" (*North Amer. Review*, Sept.–Oct., 1877) says : "The Talmud itself, that corner-stone of orthodoxy, was a stupendous innovation on the simplicity of the Bible religion," and adds in a note : "The theory of an Oral Law, delivered to Moses on Sinai and handed down from generation to generation, until it was finally embodied in the ordinances of the Talmudical academies, is a palpable fiction invented by the Talmudists in order to lend to their own decisions the sanction of divine authority." A good sign among the Jews at present is the questioning of such authority with its entailed fetters. (8) Can a Jew be brought to consider dispassionately the Christian and critical verbal (as e.g. Ps. 22 : 16, etc.) and prophetical (as e.g. Daniel's, etc.) examinations and expositions, then, provided a diligent comparison is instituted in the Old Test., there is hope. If we can influence a Jew to read such works as Hengstenberg's *Christology*, John Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, M'Caul's *Messiahship of Jesus*, Browne's *Messiah as Foretold and Expected*, Reibur's *Messianic Prophecy*, and numerous other works of a similar character, a sufficiency will be found, impressive by its weight of authority and unity and Jewish concessions, to induce an independent and conscientious search of the Scriptures. If such a posture is once assumed, we have no fears respecting the final result.

Obs. 4. The main leading objection against Jesus Christ is met in a more satisfactory manner through our doctrines. The Jew is especially hostile to the divinity of Jesus ; and the present Rationalistic attacks, notwithstanding their lowering of Jewish character and doctrine, are hailed and accepted on this account with delight by multitudes of them. Now aside from the usual proofs assigned for the divinity of Jesus, our interpretation of Scripture furnishes others which must, if duly considered, have considerable weight. For we plainly prove from the Scriptures, that the restored *Theocracy*, as predicted, *demands a God-man*, a divine-human person to sit on David's throne and rule over his kingdom. He must be One, as Covenant and prophets declare, who reigns *forever*, who has *unlimited* power, who is *both* David's *Son* and David's *Lord*, who can perform mighty wonders and exert Supernatural power *in restoring all things*. We show that the perfection, highest consistency, and beauty *of a Theocracy* is thus manifested in *the very form so desirable and necessary* for Redemptive purposes. If a Theocracy, such as the Old Test. portrays would be erected under a David's Son lacking the divine attributes ascribed to Him, *then* there would be a failure, in so far, of God's own Word. This is fully admitted by the concessions of ancient rabbis, who understood the prophecies on this point *just* as we present it. That the prophecies plainly teach the divinity of Jesus, especially as associated with the Theocracy, is apparent from this faith of the Jews,[1] so that Lederer (himself a Jew, in the *Israelite Indeed*, Aug. 1866, p. 37) says : "there are many passages in ancient Hebrew writings which plainly show that the great men of Israel believed in the Sonship of the Messiah, not in the sense in which modern rabbis would make us believe, viz., in that sense in which Israel is sometimes called 'my firstborn son,' but in the real, Divine Sonship, the incarnation of the God-head in the flesh of David's Son. We will quote but one passage : Rabbi Hunah (Midrash Shocher Tob on Prov. ch.

19) says, 'Messiah has six names, viz., Yihon, Tsemach, Menahem, David, Shiloh, and Jehovah Tsidkenu.'" Such evidence could be multiplied, but is unnecessary to the student.[2] Our entire argument makes the mighty King not only "the Branch of David" (i.e. his Son) but "the Branch of Jehovah" (i. e. His Son) and shows that a Theocracy brought to its perfected state, bringing God and man in union in a plan of government, *necessarily implies* it, which is distinctly affirmed by the duration, extent, works, power, results, etc. of His reign. (See Prop, 183, 184)[3]

[1] The nature of the Theocracy as predicted by the prophets assured the union of the divine in David's Son. Of this the Jews at the First Advent were fully persuaded as we see e.g. in Peter's expression : "*Thou art the Christ* (or *Messiah*), *the Son of the living God.*" The general expectation, founded on the Scriptures (as Ps. 2 ; Isa. 9 : 6, 7, etc.), is well stated in the High Priest's question : "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be *the Messiah, the Son of God.*" The charge of "*blasphemy*" against Jesus when He assumed the same, indicates fully and clearly in what light this Sonship was regarded ; for otherwise the conduct of the Council is contradictory and absurd. In the promised reign of the Messiah, the Jews expected the fulfilment of the Millennial predictions, and hence they were able to say what the prophet declares in Isa. 25 : 9, "*So, this is our God ; we have waited for Him and He will save us : this is the Lord ; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation.*" Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, vol. 4, p. 489) may indeed sneer at the notion of "a human and temporal King" entertained by some Jews, but this is merely one-sided, leaving out of the question the mass of testimony which introduces higher estimates of the Messiah among the Jews, so that Milman (in footnote) correctly remarks : "Most of the modern writers, who have closely examined this subject, and who will not be suspected of a theological bias, Rosenmüller on Isa. 9 : 5–7, and on Ps. 45 : 7, and Bertholdt, *Christologia Judæorum*, c. 20, rightly ascribe much higher notions of the Messiah to the Jews." If it be said that the Jews object to the Trinity, charging us with Polytheism, we leave a Jewess (*Leila Ada*, p. 207) to answer : "A literal Jew would be willing to excuse us from this charge (Polytheism), because he would say that our faith necessarily involves three persons in one God, or else there could be no atonement." But to this we add, that this necessity arises from the scriptural plan of a *pure Theocracy* in an incorporated Davidic line, so that whoever sees this Theocratic ruler in the glorified Son of David also beholds the Father—i.e. God ruling in and through Him. Comp. e.g. M'Caul's *Messiahship of Jesus ;* Black's *Messiah and Anti-Messiahs ;* Brown's *Messiah as Foretold and Expected ;* Higgenson's *Hebrew Messianic Hope and Christian Reality*, etc.

[2] We append a few more references for the accommodation of those who may not have access to them. The title of Jesus, "I am He who Am, and Was, and Will be" is used in the Targum of Palestine, which in itself embraces the divine. Dr. Etheridge in his *Trans. of the Targums* (vol. 2, p. 686) says that the old Jewish theologians gave the name of "the King of the kings of kings" to God, and also the one "the King of Peace, or the King with whom there is Peace," which were also attributed to the Messiah, and which (the first one) reproduced in the Apocalypse is one reason why the destructive critics pronounce it "Jewish." In the *Israelite Indeed*, a periodical under the editorship of a converted Jew, Lederer, are found numerous admissions of the divine Supernatural nature in connection with the human attributed by the Jews to the Messiah, among these are quotations from the Targum of Onkelos, Aben Ezra, Yarchi, Rashi, Aberbanell, Berechiah, Hoona, Kimchi, etc. In the writings of Lightfoot, in Commentaries, in various Sys. of Div. are also found an abundance of quotations which confirm the fact that many of the identical Scriptures quoted (as e.g. Ps. 2 ; Jer. 23 : 5, 6, etc.) by Christians as Messianic, are regarded such by Jewish rabbis and that a divine origin and nature is also ascribed to Him. Our space forbids a repetition of them, however interesting.

[3] Rev. Isaac Leeser gives, in the "His. of the Jews and their Religion" (see Rupp's *Orig. His. of Relig. Denominations*), the belief that Moses "was the greatest of all the prophets and wise men who have lived before him or will come after him," and "the belief in the Coming of the King Messiah, who is to accomplish for the world and Israel all that the prophets have foretold concerning Him," and then (p. 365) he explains : "The Messiah, whom we expect, is not to be a god, nor a part of a godhead, nor a Son of God in any sense of the word ; but simply a man eminently endowed like Moses and the prophets in the days of the Bible, to work out the will of God on earth in all that the

prophets have predicted of him." But he fails to tell us *how* a mere man can fulfil the requirements of the prophets, in the restitution of all things and the realization of Millennial descriptions. He overlooks the simple fact that this Messiah is to be immeasurably superior to Moses in every respect, and that in numerous predictions what is ascribed to this Messiah is fully ascribed *to God Himself*. He conveniently passes by the ancient belief of the Jews and engrafts another faith, as e.g. see Prop. 159, Obs. 2 (comp. Props. 199, 200), where it is shown that the Jews believed that this Messiah would be "the eternal King," and His Kingdom "the eternal Kingdom of David," etc., which cannot possibly be asserted of a mere mortal, seeing that *such perpetuity* necessarily embraces the divine. The study of the nature, design, etc., of the Theocracy, as it is to be restored, will inevitably lead to the firm belief that God Himself in the Person of David's Son is the Theocratic King. How this wonderfully exalts the King and the nation, need not be pointed out, and yet, is it not strange that the very feature needed to crown the Theocratic ordering with its *highest, most desirable* excellence should be objected to so strenuously by the Jew? Indeed it is for this reason that the nation has brought upon itself for so many centuries the dread punishment of God. For let it be considered that nowhere is it asserted in direct terms that the nation shall be driven from the land and scattered among the nations for the rejection of the Messiah, but this is directly predicted as a result of *their rejection of God* as their Ruler, etc. Now we ask the Jew how his nation thus rejected God and incurred the fearful destruction of the temple, of Jerusalem, of the nation, etc., unless it be *in the person of Jesus*, as He expressly claimed. If the Jewish theory (or rather Rabbinical) is correct, then the rejection of an alleged impostor ought to have brought them the favor and blessing of God, but instead of this the exact reverse—as predicted by this Messiah—has occurred. To what conclusion can we come excepting that *in this Messiah* they rejected God Himself, the Theocratic King.

Later writers among the Jews have, as is notorious, contradicted older writers in the applications of Scripture, in order to weaken, if possible, the interpretations and appeals of Christians in favor of the Messiahship of Jesus. This is frankly acknowledged by David Kimchi on 2d Ps. We give an illustration: Ps. 2, as Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 97, etc.) has shown, is fairly applicable to "the Christ," as maintained even by the old Jewish doctors (as Solomon Iarchi agreed that "it should be expounded of King Messiah," but added: "In accordance with the literal sense and that it may be used against heretics" (i.e. Christians) "it is proper to explain it as relating to David himself.") Fairbairn justly observes that the Rationalistic interpretation which would apply it to David is not sustained by the acts here ascribed to the One specified (as e.g. David was not opposed in establishing his throne by heathen nations, and when established he did not seek dominion over the kings and rulers of the earth, etc.). This is so plain that "some even of those who formerly espoused it (i.e. the Davidic application)—such as Rosenmüller—have at length owned that "it cannot well be understood as applying either to David or to Solomon, much less to any of the later Hebrew kings, and that the judgment of the more ancient Hebrews is to be followed, who considered it as a celebration of the mighty King that they expected under the name of the Messiah." The same is true of Ps. 132; Ps. 110; Ps. 89, and others; and what binds those Psalms into an irresistible Messianic prediction, is the simple, uncontrovertible fact that the Messiah of the covenant and the Messiah of the Psalms is still the same Messiah predicted by the prophets after David's and Solomon's reign. The expectation of the Jews at the First Advent, and their utter inability (as e.g. evidenced Matt. 22 : 42–45) to withstand the Messianic application, as well as the abundant concessions of later rabbis, teach us how to receive them. But if so then their application to One who is far more than a mere man inevitably follows, and with it, that the birth, life, works, etc., of Jesus alone fully meet all the conditions imposed by the predictions. Micah 5 : 2, 3, 4 alone—if pondered in the light given by Jesus—should be sufficient to convince the Jew that the high and glorious nature we Christians ascribe to the Messiah is essential to the fulfilment of God's own Word. Modern Jews (*Leilu Ada*, p. 180) may make Isa. 53 "an allegorical representation of their own sufferings," but this cannot be its meaning without undue violence to the passage, and without contradicting the large number who have applied it to a suffering Messiah. Barnes (*Com. on Hebrews*, ch. 1 : 6) informs us: "Two Jewish rabbis of distinction—Raschi and Kimchi—affirm that all the Psalms from 93 to 101 are to be regarded as referring to the Messiah. Such was, and is, the opinion of the (orthodox) "Jews." Let the reader pass over these Psalms, and he will find that the Messiah therein described can be none other than the Mighty God, seeing that the dominion, power, exaltation, glory, etc., ascribed to Him cannot be applied to mere man. The student who desires to investigate the Scripture passages of a Messianic nature and their

application to Jesus, will find these in works specially devoted to the subject, and, more or less, in the commentaries on the Bible. The abundance of material in this direction is vast and satisfactory. Thus, e.g. Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 332) remarks respecting Isa. chs. 61, 62, 49, 53, that "it is a matter of certainty that, in the judgment of the ancient Jewish Church, the person spoken of in all these passages was the Messiah"—and refers to "Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. 12 : 20 and John 5 : 19 ; Schöttgen *de Messiâ*, pp. 113, 192 ; Hengstenberg's *Christology*, on Isa. 42 : 1–9 and chs. 49 and 53 : 2. Also Alexander on the same passages and ch. 61." The student may compare what Gladstone (*Studies on Homer*, vol. 2, pp. 48–51, and *Juventus Mundi*, p. 205–6) says of the Jewish traditions respecting the divinity of the Messiah, being "the glory of God," having two natures, being the Logos, Word, or Wisdom, "the Lord of Hosts," the Light, the Mediator, having abundant Supernatural power and divine attributes, conquering the evil one, delivering from the dead, etc. (comp. Schöttgen's *Horæ Hebraicæ*.)

It is self-evident that the ascension of the Messiah to the right hand of God (Ps. 110)—fulfilled in the history of Jesus—shows that He is exalted far above mere man ; that the righteous Branch of David (Jer. 23 : 5, 6), when designated "*Jehovah, our Righteousness*, must be divine ; that the ancient Jewish applications of Messianic predictions (such e.g. as Ps. 2 ; Isa. 11 ; Ps. 80 : 14 (15) ; Mic. 5 : 1 ; Hag. 2 : 7–9 ; Mal. 3 : 1, etc.), exalt this Messiah immeasurably above mortal man, and hence, the New Test. standpoint, which ascribes so much of the divine to Jesus, is the correct one in the portrayal of *a true Messiah*. Philo of Alexandria (between A.D. 40 and 50), a Jewish theologian, advanced views of a Logos so striking in its counterpart to John's Gospel that it has excited considerable discussion. One party (as Semisch, etc.) think that Philo's Logos was a personal hypostasis ; another (as Dorner, etc.) deem it merely a personification of wisdom or a divine attribute ; and others (as Schaff, etc.) that Philo "vibrates between the two views." Now whatever position we may assume, one thing is conclusive, viz., that Philo had no idea of a mere man being the Messiah to fulfil the promises, but that he attributed deliverance and the fulfilment of Millennial predictions to something that was superhuman. This is precisely the position assigned to the Logos in the New Test., only that the covenanted union with David's Son is distinctively asserted in connection, thus in the Person of Jesus uniting the two, and preserving the unity of covenant and prophecy. We add : the time is coming when all objections to Jesus as the Messiah shall be forever removed. And that is, when the Jews shall say (Isa. 25 : 9), "*Lo, this is our God ;*" for as Fausset (*Com. loci*) has well remarked : "The Jews have a special share in the words, 'This is our God.'" Repentant and believing they shall yet exult in the Crucified One.

Obs. 5. The doctrine meets the more modern Jewish objection urged against the resurrection of Jesus. For it points significantly to the prophets (as e.g. Isa. 9 : 6, 7 ; Ps. 72 : 7, 17 ; Ps. 89 : 35–37 ; Ps. 104 : 4, etc.) which teach, that David's Son is immortal in that His reign endures forever, and that with Him are associated the pious dead, etc. Then it refers to the expectations of pious Jews before the Advent, who held (John 12 : 34), to such an immortal Messiah, and such a resurrection of dead ones, and shows how, as the apostles explain by the resurrection from the dead, Jesus now never dies again and how, also, through that resurrection *a pledge* is given that the prophets will be fulfilled in the resurrection of others. The resurrection is proven to be *a necessary and indispensable preparation* for, and adjunct of, *the Theocracy*. How else can David's Son reign as the prophets describe unless immortal? And how can man born of a woman become immortal unless he, in some way, triumph over death ? And what greater triumph is required than that ascribed to Jesus? Hence, when the resurrection is regarded as *a part* of the Divine Plan, *in its prerequisite relationship* to the Theocracy, it is the very thing which ought to be manifested in order to fulfil the prophets and give us undoubted faith in such fulfilment (comp. Props. 46–50, 125).

How far the Scriptures were fulfilled in the First Advent of Christ has been shown by many writers, such as Horne, Newton, Keith, Simpson, etc., and to such an extent

that no one, with unprejudiced mind, can deny a remarkable literal fulfilment. In the consideration of this subject this fulfilment ought to be regarded. We then, in general, have (1) the predictions which declare the immortal continuance of David's Son (with which is allied His character, attributes, etc.) ; (2) the predictions of His death and resurrection, contrasting them with the fulfilment recorded in the Gospel ; (3) the manner in which this corroborates the Theocratic ordering, providing in the Person of Jesus, the covenanted Messiah. *Leila Ada* (p. 120) brings in the following points in her appeal to her Jewish father, as predicted in the prophets and realized in Jesus : He was to be (1) David's descendant ; (2) His mother a virgin ; (3) born in Bethlehem ; (4) humble birth ; (5) without external recommendations to public notice ; (6) reside in Galilee ; (7) a life of suffering ; (8) rejected by the Jews ; (9) betrayed by a friend ; (10) treated as a malefactor ; (11) mocked and insulted ; (12) display meekness and patience ; (13) put to a violent death ; (14) His executioners were to divide His apparel ; (15) cast lots for His vesture ; (16) interred in a rich man's tomb ; (17) rise from the dead ; (18) His body not undergoing corruption ; (19) He was to leave the world ; (20) ascend to heaven. The Scriptures involved can be seen in detail (as e.g. in the Appendix, No. VI. of Horne's *Introd.*) in works specially devoted to this fulfilment. The most careless cannot help being struck by the numerous and startling fulfilments in reference to essential points and minute particulars. Time, regular descent, place, offices, preaching, works, public entry into the city, etc., are mingled with the price of betrayal, the spitting, reviling, vinegar and gall, unbroken bones, pierced side, dying with malefactors but honorable burial, etc., so that a firm believer in God's Word must see how they all meet in Jesus ; and that, in view of their publicity and of their occurring under Roman jurisdiction, they could not have been concocted, etc., by the evangelists. If the question is asked why, then, did not the nation that witnessed these coincidences receive Jesus as the Messiah (1) when it was the earnest wish of the nation to have the Messiah to come and deliver it from the Roman power, and (2) when this desire was exhibited afterward in the success of one who pretended to be " the Christ," drawing a large portion of the nation into open revolt against the Romans, and (3) when the Jews did not deny the miraculous works of Jesus (even the scandalous *Toldoth Jeshu* conceding these), but ascribed them either to the power of the Beelzebub, or to the influence of magic, or to the supposed mystic virtue of the Shem-hamphorash, the Ineffable Name, although such works were believed to accompany the Messiah ? The answer is plain and decisive ; the Gospels are specially written to show *why* Jesus was thus rejected. The ground of objection was the unpalatable doctrine of *repentance* by which the Kingdom was conditioned. A theocracy, in the nature of the case, cannot be set up over a nation so steeped in sin and crime as the Jewish nation was—as evidenced by Josephus, etc.—at the First Advent. The refusal of the Messiah to establish it until the nation made itself worthy of it by repentance and obedience to the Word of God—this excited *the hostility and bitterness* of the representative men of the nation, until it culminated in the death of their own Messiah. They expected a Messiah to come and set up His Kingdom *without* calling them to forsake sin—to be a temporal Deliverer *without* urging faith and obedience with its resultant fruits—to re-establish and exalt the throne and Kingdom of David *without* requiring an antecedent manifestation of humble confession of sin and an honest turning to God with reverence and love. Hence the preaching of the forerunner of Jesus, of the disciples and Apostles, and the wonderful works, signs, and fulfilments, while persuading many—even of the priests—to receive Jesus as the Messiah and endure persecution for His sake, left the body of the nation unrepentant and intensely prejudiced against Him.

Look at this Jesus in the light of all these particulars, and then, if Jews will believe their own Scriptures, they see how it constitutes Him one who can be " the Judge of Israel." How can this Judgship be better proven than by Paul in Acts 17 : 31 ? How can " the tree of life (which) was not created in vain, but the men of the resurrection shall eat thereof and live forever" (so e.g. R. Elias ben Mosis, and R. Menahem, in Answorth on Gen. 2), be restored *unless* it be through a Second Adam like Jesus (Rev. 2 : 7 and 22 : 14) ? How can the covenanted promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to inherit the land personally be realized without resurrection, and who *so able* to perform this as a Messiah that has vindicated His power over the grave, like Jesus ? How can the ransomed of the Lord return to Zion, and how can the supernatural results pertaining to a perfected and glorious redemption be experienced, *unless* the Messiah is such an one as Jesus is represented to be in the New Test. ? Such questions might be multiplied, and show that the portraiture of Jesus, as given in the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse is just such an one *as is demanded* by the Old Test. in order to secure its fulfilment.

Obs. 6. It brings in with greater force and pertinency the necessity of the Messiah making *a sacrifice* of Himself for sin. Aside from the usual arguments presented, and the appeals made to the predictions of a suffering Saviour by the prophets, and fulfilled in Jesus, it specially directs attention to the necessity of His death in order that the Abrahamic Covenant itself may (as Paul argues) be sealed or confirmed. By *the efficacy* of this death, abundant provision is made for *the ample realization* of the covenant: an immortal King is provided who is able to save—through Him all that believe, can and will be saved as predicted, for He now has power to forgive sin, to save from the results of sin, to raise up the dead, etc. The entire spirit of the Old Test. evinces that the Covenant can never be fulfilled without such a sacrifice, for it contemplates a restoration, ample and complete, to forfeited blessings. To make the Covenant available, *provision must first be made to meet the sinfulness and results of sin even in believers,* which the typical sacrifices could not effect. This is strikingly and effectively done in Him who is to be the Head of the Theocracy. Our argument does not simply ascribe salvation through Christ, but salvation through Him in and for this Theocratic elevation. He is indeed the born King of the nation, being the promised seed, and who so worthy (being sinless as the prophets predict) to make atonement, to effect reconciliation, to stand as mediator as this King. For, if the Jew will but consider *what this Theocracy demands,* if ever realized as prophecy represents it, such as moral purity, the triumph over the grave, the presence of God, the return to an Edenic state, the removal of the curse, etc., *he must see* that such an important transformation can *never* take place unless He, through and in whom God again condescends to act in the capacity of an earthly ruler, is *both* sinless Himself, and has power to act as Mediator and Redeemer of sinful man. It is through the King that the blessings of Redemption enjoyed under a restored Theocratic rule are to be realized, so all the prophets with one voice testify—and Jesus Christ as described in the New Test., *meets in every respect the requirements of prophecy,* in person, in character, in work already performed, in station, in promise, etc., preparative to the ultimate end. If in the history of Jesus, coming as Messiah, there was no provision for sin, no purchase of immortality, no triumph over death, no recognition and exaltation by the Father, *an important, yea deadly, flaw* would exist, and the Jew would *then be justified* in turning away from him, saying that the Messiah really promised by the prophets would exhibit His ability to deliver in person and work; but now since these are *abundantly evidenced* in Jesus, *is he justified* in turning away from Him? Indeed, if he reflects how shortly after the rejection of Jesus, who manifested in person and work His perfect adaptedness to the Theocratic Kingship, the nation guilty of rejecting Him was so terribly smitten and scattered, he finds that his own reason alleged for the overthrow of the nation, viz. on account of sinfulness against or rejection of Jehovah, *is fully verified in Jesus;* because, unless Jehovah be regarded as identified with the person of Jesus, it would, owing to their belief in and worship of Jehovah in God the Father, be improper to say that Jehovah was rejected by them, excepting it be through Christ. In considering the claims of Jesus, it certainly ought to be of weight, that the rejection of Him and of His sacrifice was followed by a terrible overthrow of the nation and a continued subjection, as He and the prophets predicted, under Gentile domination, down to the present day. It confirms

the validity of His Theocratic Kingship, and the preciousness of His sacrifice.

Indeed, if Jesus had been an impostor, then the Father, instead of bringing such terrible calamities upon the nation as predicted, ought *rather* to have blessed the nation for its zeal, etc. But taking Moses and the Prophets, what was done against the Messiah Jesus was done, as Jesus claimed, against God, the Father, Himself. If the Jew is candid in examining the New Test., he must be deeply affected by two things : (1) that a Messiah should predict His own death and the continued depression of a nation that is His own inheritance. Imposture is incapable of *such* a procedure ; it would inevitably bring forth the exact reverse. Now, in view of the singularity of this teaching, to say nothing of its astounding nature, should not the Jew be influenced to dispassionately consider *the reasons* assigned for such a mode of procedure? (2) The predictions of the Messiah—so accurately fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the scattering of the nation, the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, the continued Gentile domination—should have a mournful interest to the Jew, seeing *the realization* of the same in Jewish history. And, may we add, should not this very fulfilment have a tendency to cause him to feel that the One that could thus predict must, indeed, have been the Messiah. These predictions were based on the sinfulness of the nation, and certainly the Jew cannot censure us for repeating this statement, when their own prayer-books, accounting for dispersion, captivity, and suffering, fully and frankly, in general terms, admit the past sinfulness of the nation—an admission forcibly urged by the prophets. How Jewish writers inadvertently fasten upon themselves the sin of crucifying the Messiah is forcibly shown by *Leila Ada* (a converted Jewess), p. 121, in her appeal to her father, saying that in a Jewish work called *Yoma* the question is asked : "Why was the second temple destroyed?" And one of the principal causes given is this one : "On account of the hatred without cause." She then adds : "I refer them to Ps. 69, one which is admitted by Aben Ezra to be prophetical of the Messiah. 'They hated me without a cause,' is charged by our Saviour upon His enemies." *Leila Ada*, p. 59, asks what terrible sin her ancestors had committed which called for eighteen centuries of removal from the land, when her fathers, guilty of idolatry—the greatest sin against God—had only seventy years of captivity enforced, etc. She (p. 122) remarks : "Nor is it possible that the Jews can be altogether blind to the curse which has rested upon our nation through the eighteen hundred years which have elapsed since the crucifixion of Jesus. 'What adequate cause can be assigned for our long protracted chastisement?' is one of their solemn questions. 'What can that crime be, which was committed by our ancestors, and of which to this day we have not repented? Whatever it is, it must be some act or deed of a most atrocious character, an act or deed in the approval of which we have steadfastly persisted, and the guilt of which we have obstinately refused to acknowledge.' And if they will seriously reflect, they cannot avoid the conclusion that there is no one deed, to which in all ages they have given their adhesion, except the crucifixion of Jesus. With that event, too (and they cannot avoid observing it), commences the era of their sufferings and distresses. Here, what is related of Rabbi Solomon Marochan occurs to me : while reflecting upon the iniquities of the Jews, he said, 'The prophet Amos mentions a fourth crime for which we have been in our captivity—of selling the Just One for silver. It manifestly appears to me that for selling the Just One we are justly punished. It is now one thousand years and more, and during all this time we have made no good hand of it among the Gentiles, nor is there any likelihood of our ever any more turning to good. O my God! I am afraid lest the Jesus, whom the Christians worship, be the Just One whom we sold for silver!'" Can a Christian read this without being profoundly moved in sympathy, or can a Jew reflect upon it without deeply feeling the force of its appeal? Can a Jew ponder the statements of prophets that the Messiah would be rejected by the nation, that Gentiles would be called during such a time of rejection, that the nation would endure dispersion and suffering as a result, that at some future time they would acknowledge their sin and repent, etc., without the conviction being forced on him that in and through Jesus this has been most wonderfully exemplified? Isaac da Costa (see art. "Messiah" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) was converted by reflecting on the long-continued dispersion of the Jewish nation for its sins—the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah resolving all enigmas. The same is true of others ; and all such have realized that in addition to the argumentation appealing to reason, there was combined, on the acceptance of Jesus, the most satisfactory of all proof, viz., that derived from personal experience, enforcing a well-grounded consciousness that Jesus was indeed an all-sufficient Saviour and "the Christ"—as illustrated e.g. in the life of *Leila Ada*, Wolfe, and others.

Obs. 7. The Kingdom as explained by the prevailing theories is a stumbling-block to the Jew. With the Old Test. delineation of the Kingdom, its Theocratic and covenant relationship to their nation, its overthrow and promised restoration under the Messiah, etc., it is impossible to move them to receive a Kingdom which is widely different from the covenanted one, and of which professed believers are so uncertain that it is the subject of many and contradictory meanings and interpretations. The Kingdom that the Old Test. plainly predicts for him, is one that when established is so openly visible and associated with the rebuilt throne and Kingdom of David, that he rejects as utterly untrustworthy the interpretation which declares that the ruined tabernacle of David *shall never be restored* in the sense contained grammatically by the language of the prophets. This spiritualizing of the covenant promises and prophecies pertaining to the Kingdom, and thus making them to mean what the fancy of the interpreter can apply to the present dispensation or Church, has had a powerful influence upon the Jewish mind, and has materially aided in confirming unbelief. For, when he looks at the Church, or at this age, he finds *no such* a Messianic Kingdom as his prophets promised, *no such* a glorious restoration of his nation under Davidic rule as the Spirit predicted, and hence, influenced by the usurped claim of the Christian Church, and warped by the apparent antagonism, he turns away from Christianity itself. Our doctrine, on the other hand, gives a simple, unfettered, consistent statement of the promised Kingdom, receiving it just as once established, just as incorporated with David's line and people, without changing the language into something else; and thus by its unity of purpose confirms the truthfulness of the grammatical sense believed in by the pious Jews. Hence it is better adapted as evidenced by the history of the primitive Church, to meet and obviate the objections of the Jews.

Making the Christian Church, which is only preparative, to be the covenanted Messianic Kingdom, forms a fruitful source of difficulty to the Jew. Thus e.g. a Jew (art. "Messiah," M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*) objects: "We dissent from the proposition that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah announced by the prophets, because the Church which He founded, and which His successors developed, has offered, during a succession of centuries, a most singular contrast to what is described in the Hebrew Scriptures as the immediate consequence of Messiah's Advent, and of His glorious Kingdom. The prophet Isaiah declares that when the Messiah appears, peace, love, and union will be permanently established; and every candid man must admit that the world has not yet realized the accomplishment of this prophecy. Again, in the days of the Messiah, all men, as Scripture saith, 'are to serve God with one accord,' and yet it is very certain that since the appearance of Him whom our Christian brethren believe to be Messiah, mankind has been split into more hostile divisions on the grounds of religious belief, and more antagonistic sects have sprung up than in any historic age before Christianity was preached." This, and far more in the same direction, could be alleged as true; and the representation of the Church as the predicted Messianic Kingdom (and not, as it is, a preparatory stage for the same) is only increasing the difficulties of a Jew's acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah. It likewise is disgraceful to professed Christians to take up the stale falsehoods that are fastened upon Jewish views of the Messianic Kingdom, viz., that they regarded it as something similar to earthly kingdoms, like the Roman, etc. Now, while it is true that some Jews had a low and gross view of the Kingdom, yet many and leading minds had a correct idea that it would be different from mere earthly kingdoms, because it would be essentially *Theocratic*, a restoration of *the Theocracy*, to be revived and manifested in the Person of the Messiah. They are unjustly ridiculed and censured because of the expectation of universal dominion under the Messiah's rule. But is it not predicted in the plainest possible language that *their* Messiah should be a Ruler over their own nation, and also over all other nations? Did they believe in the ultimate downfall of all other kingdoms, and which has called forth thousands of sarcasms? This, too, is clearly predicted. That which, probably, has caused more unjust

accusations and witless ridicule is the notion entertained respecting Jewish supremacy. But if there is any truth distinctively taught in the Scriptures, then that of Jewish supremacy is one (see e.g. Prop. 114), destined to prove an inestimable blessing to all other nations.

Obs. 8. How poorly in effectiveness the arguments of the Jew have been met by later Christian apologists, is self-evident if we glance over the history of apologetics. The line of reply adopted by Origen in his answer to Celsus, has been substantially readopted and repeated down to the present day. Thus e. g. to illustrate : when Celsus from a Jewish standpoint (b. 2, ch. 29) urges the objection that "the prophets declare the Coming One to be a mighty Potentate, Lord of all nations and armies" and deduces from the failure of such a manifestation of Jesus that He is not the One predicted, Origen answers correctly when he shows that there are two Advents, a first and a second, separated by an interval of time, and that the Coming of Jesus as such a Potentate is to be referred to the Sec. Advent, but he does not really break the force of the objection when he portrays the results of such a Sec. Coming to be the winding up of *all sublunary affairs* etc., while the prophets describe a very different state of affairs, viz. a great glorious reign over the restored Jewish nation, and the nations here on the earth—to follow such an Advent. The main point of the objection, that of the reign of the Messiah as predicted, is *not* answered by this mode of reasoning and *cannot* be met by it. On the other hand, our doctrine satisfactorily meets it, showing how this reign, as *earthly* Potentate is postponed until the Sec. Advent when the covenants and the prophets will be fulfilled *in the manner* delineated by the Word. The Jewish expectations, drawn legitimately from the prophecies, are by the Apostles linked with the Sec. Advent, and the very phraseology growing out of these expectations are thus adopted by them without the least intimation that they are to be understood differently from common usage. Hence our view, instead of denying those legitimate Jewish deductions from the prophets, confirms them as indispensable to the fulfilment of the Word.

The difficulty with many is this : they insist upon one Advent of the Messiah. Thus e.g. they thus apply Isa. 11 :1–10. Accepting of the Messianic interpretation of Kimchi, Abrabanel, and other Jewish commentators, they (as e.g. Rev. Prof. Marks in *Jewish Messenger*, Jan., 1872) say that with the appearing of the Messiah are a series of synchronous events, such as the final restoration of the Jewish nation, universal peace and harmony, the overthrow of all enemies, etc., and that the Messiah is known by the accomplishment of these predicted events. Consequently they argue that taking one Advent as alone taught, such events not taking place at and after the Advent of Jesus, but the reverse occurring, He cannot, therefore, be the Messiah. All hinges on the one Advent theory. But we have shown in the body of the work (e.g. Prop. 34) why the two Advents are not more distinguished the one from the other, and why two become necessary in order to fulfil all that is predicted. Besides this, it alone reconciles the two states of humiliation and of exaltation attributed to the Messiah. We thus retain the one Messiah. The invention of two Messiahs (see art. "Messiah" in Herzog's *Cyclop.*) was utterly unknown to the earlier Targums and the earlier Gemara of Jerusalem, which have but one Messiah, the Son of David. The Gemara of Babylon (about the sixth century, so Horne's *Introd.*) has a second Messiah, the Son of Joseph ; and the Targum of the Song of Songs (Tar. Megil.) 4 ; 5 ; 7, 3, says, "Your Redeemers are two, who will redeem you, the Messiah the Son of David, and the Messiah the Son of Ephraim, like unto Moses and Aaron." (This Targum is noted—Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 1, p. 263—for its "dull glosses and fabulous additions ;" with which comp. arts. "Antichrist" and "Messiah" in Smith's *Bib. Dic.*, and M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) More modern writers to avoid making two, apply the predictions of humiliation to some prophet, or king, or to the Jewish nation itself, thus violating the earlier applications. Our distinctive view of the

two Advents is of such a nature that it *consistently* reconciles the prophecies as fulfilled in *the one* Messiah, David's Son and Lord.

Certainly the Jews should not accuse us of folly in still looking for the Messiah, and in regarding His Coming as imminent. This has been the posture of a multitude of Jews in the past. Aside from the general opinion (e.g. art. "Messiah" in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*) on the subject at the Advent of Jesus of Nazareth, the imposition of false Messiahs (see arts. on, in above and others), the calculations of Rabbi Saadia, Abraham Ibn-Chija, Nachman, Gersoni, Abrabanel and others, the repeated failures of estimates causing an interdict to repress calculations of time, the intense yearnings and hopes inspired in periods of persecution and depression, the numerous utterances of writers, all evince that in calling into question and decrying our position, they would be deriding the pious and learned of their own nation.

Obs. 9. But as our object is briefly to indicate how our doctrine fairly meets and removes Jewish objections, it is not necessary to enter into additional details. The attentive reader will not fail to notice, that in many points it is well adapted for this purpose. The spirit of it calls upon the Gentiles not to be "high-minded," to consider that their call (as predicted even by Moses) is the result of Jewish unbelief, but which unbelief shall finally give place to a cordial reception of Jesus Christ, when the times of the Gentiles have run their allotted course. It is disposed to allow and defend the distinctive position of the Jewish nation, the necessity of identification by engrafting with it to secure the blessings of Redemption covenanted to it, and even the supremacy of that nation after the restoration, in virtue of its Theocratic position. It sympathizes most cordially with the down-trodden Jerusalem and the scattered nation, never forgetting that the glory of the adopted Gentiles and that of the Kingdom itself can *never* be realized, as promised, until Jerusalem and its nation experience the returned mercy of God and His Christ. It vindicates Jesus Christ and His teaching from the Jewish ground itself, and thus commends Jesus as the true fulfiller of the prophets.

The great trouble, however, in reaching the Jews, is their own lack of candor, for the modern Jews especially will not allow passages that the ancient Jews applied to the Messiah to have any such reference, lest Christians should be enabled to take advantage of the same in behalf of Jesus. This is illustrated e.g. by McCaul (*Aids of Faith*, Essay 3, p. 100), who refers to Ps. 2, as referred to the Messiah by ancient Jews, saying: "This is confessed even by Rashi in the eleventh century, who remarks, 'Our Rabbis interpret this Psalm of the Messiah,' to which was added in the older copies of his commentary, 'but in order to answer the heretics it is better to interpret it of David,' words still found in the commentary on the 21st Psalm." They are especially unfair to the divinity of Jesus, denying e.g. that He is "the Son of God," when as Lederer (*Israelite Indeed*, March, 1867, etc.) proves that some of their writers declare that Jesus assumed the title belonging to the real Messiah. They object to Jesus being called "the Word," and with lack of frankness conceal what their own past literature ascribes to "the Messiah" (comp. Barnes, *Com. on John*, ch. 1 : 1, where e.g. the Targum on Deut. 26 : 17, 18, says: "Ye have appointed *the Word of God* a King over you this day, that He may be your God"). The plainest statements applied to the Messiah, as Deut. 18 : 18, 19 (comp. Kurtz, *His Old Cov.*, vol. 3, p. 475), or Micah 2 : 13 (comp. Pearson *On the Creed*, p. 413, foot-note) must be lowered to avoid the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, and the sayings of their Targums (comp. e.g. Dr. Etheridge's *Trans. of the Targum of Onkelos*, pp. 6, 16, 17, for divinity of Messiah) must be concealed from the mass of their people lest it be found favorable to the crucified one. Such language as the following –highly indicative of the Theocratic ordering, and that instead of our making more gods than one we make God's rule in the Person of David's Son—is totally ignored. Dr. Hales (quoted, Horne's *Introd.*, vol. 2, p. 275) cites a remark from the ancient Rabbinical book of Ikkarim, illustrating Jer. 23 : 5, 6, "The Scripture calls the name of the Messiah *Jaoh*, Our Righteousness, to intimate that He will be *a mediatorial God*, by whose hand we shall obtain *justification* from *the Name*; wherefore it calls Him by the name of THE NAME (that is, the ineffable

name *Jaoh*, here put *for God Himself*"). Especially do we find modern writers unfair to Isa. 53, for in their efforts to make it non-Messianic, they give the most varied interpretations, applying it to Jeremiah or the Israelitish people, or to the godly portion of the nation, or to the prophetical body, or to Uzziah, or to Hezekiah, or to the house of David, or to an interpolation. They carefully ignore past Jewish concessions (comp. Hengstenberg's *Christology*, Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony*, art. "Prophet," in M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, etc., on the passage). So in the interpretation of the seventy weeks of Daniel (comp. art. "Messiah," M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, Lange's *Com. Daniel*, p. 206, etc.), they carefully exclude from notice—to avoid the Christian application—the concessions of Kimchi, Jarchi, Rabbi Saadias, and other learned Jews. So likewise the Coming of the Messiah to the temple, His being pierced, sold, etc. (Lange's *Com.* Zech., pp. 71, 96, etc.), all must be so interpreted—over against Jewish concessions and the strongest evidence—as to forbid an application to Jesus. The entire spirit of such a course simply manifests prejudice, and an unwillingness to approach the subject with that candor which it eminently deserves. We cannot censure them more than we do a class of professed Christians (as e.g. Williams in *Essays and Reviews*) who endeavor, in their destructive efforts, to make out that the Messianic predictions of Isaiah have no reference whatever to Christ, a position which is fully answered by the declaration of Jesus Himself (Luke 24 : 25–27, 44–47) and the quotations from Isaiah (Matt. 8 : 17, and 12 : 18–21, and 15 : 8, 9 ; Acts 8 : 32, 33, and 13 : 34, 47, etc.).

Obs. 10. Our doctrine brings forth with prominency the idea that the Messiah is a temporal Deliverer. With all the inestimable spiritual blessings, the deliverance from sin and the results of sin, we have added as inseparably connected a remarkable temporal deliverance. This is so identified with the restoration of the Jewish nation and the re-establishment of the Theocracy by the Messiah, that it is folly to deny the expectations and hopes of the pious Jews and primitive Christians on this point. If language has any definite meaning, and if God will ever fulfil His covenants and promises as written, then glorious temporal deliverance must, in the nature of the case, be incorporated. In the "Ageda" a meeting of Jewish Rabbis in the year 1650, held in the plain of that name, about ninety miles from Buda, the question was discussed whether the Messiah had come and was decided in the negative. The reasons given for this conclusion—and which have the greatest weight still with the Jewish mind—were based on the fact that the prophet linked the restoration and prosperity of the Jewish nation, the restoration and exaltation of the Davidic throne and Kingdom with the Coming of the Messiah. As these events had *not yet* transpired, as the nation has *not yet* met with temporal deliverance, etc., it was assumed that the Messiah had *not yet* come, thus overlooking that the same prophets predict *a previous rejection* of the same Messiah, a consequent continued fall of the nation, a call of the Gentiles, and after a long endurance of punishment *the return* of the Messiah for promised deliverance. They, unfortunately, only allow a portion of Scripture its due weight, and ignore, although sustained by historical fact, the remainder. They also refuse to examine the claims of Jesus to this title, and how this very temporal deliverance, so long and ardently prayed for, is postponed to the Sec. Advent. We can readily see, however, what decided influence the prevailing Christian theology which denies all this, *although plainly covenanted and predicted*, must have had in deciding these Jews to reject Jesus as "the Messiah." For if, as many Christians declare, this Jesus is not to restore the Jewish nation and elevate it in honor and power ; if He is not to re-establish the Davidic throne and Kingdom, exalting it in dominion and glory over the earth, *then* it necessarily and inevitably follows that Jesus is not the Messiah covenanted to David and predicted by the

prophets. But if, on the other hand, it can be shown and proven (as our Propositions logically and scripturally do) that this Jesus is to return and perform this work, *then* it also legitimately follows that the Jew has no excuse in rejecting Him as the Christ. This Jesus will yet come as promised, and then the full parallel between Him and Moses (Acts 7 : 35–37 ; Deut. 18 : 15–18) will be brought out, a Deliverer of the nation and the instrument through whom a Theocracy is established. Our view, therefore, urges the Jew to cleave to the most precious oath-bound promises relating to his nation and the Messiah ; it confirms the faith of the nation in its ultimate deliverance and glory through the power of this returning Jesus.

The Jew may again ask why did not Jesus perform this work at His First Advent? Again we remind him that this was all tendered to the nation on condition of repentance, for certainly, God could not condescend to re-establish a Theocracy and rule as King over a nation so corrupt as that nation was at the First Advent. This wickedness has been so faithfully described by a converted Jewess (*Leila Ada*, p. 109) in her interesting letter (revealing her conversion to Christianity to her father) that we quote it. After alluding to the Jewish hope of temporal deliverance, and how it was expressed by Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, she adds : "And those who rejected, blasphemed, insulted, and crucified the Messiah, could it be expected that He would grant such heinous sinners temporal deliverance? That at about the period of the Coming of Jesus, the Jews were a most iniquitous nation, is proved by the testimony of Josephus ; so wicked that he observes, 'If God had not sent the Romans as His executioners, the earth would have opened and swallowed us up.' What a dreadful place! And, doubtless, the most crying evil of these people was their rejection and treatment of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. How could such sinners expect deliverance?" etc. Let any unbiassed mind read e.g. the trial, condemnation, and death of this Jesus as presented in all its simplicity in the Gospels, and see the conduct of the representative men of the nation, and is not the direct testimony of this Jesus concerning the corruption extant most forcibly and fearfully vindicated? Is it not reasonable that the Jew should allow the New Testament to assign its reasons *why* Jesus did not bring the promised deliverance ; *why* the nation did not repent ; *why* the Kingdom was postponed : *why* Jesus will come at His Sec. Advent as the triumphant Messiah ; *why* the Messianic prophecies were held in abeyance on account of the sins of the nation, etc., thus bringing, without destroying the brightest of Jewish hopes, the New Test. into cordial sympathy and agreement with the Old Test.

PROPOSITION 194. *This doctrine of the Kingdom materially aids to explain the World's History.*

With a knowledge of this Kingdom, its germ in the Covenant, its divine institution, its withdrawal, its tender and rejection, its postponement, its preparatory stages, and, above all, its final restoration under the Messiah, it is possible to explain the history of the world in a consistent manner. This is fully admitted by later writers on history (however they may explain the Kingdom) as e.g. by the Protestant Neander (*His. of the Church*) and the Roman Cath. Schlegel (*Philos. of History*). The better the nature, characteristics and the manner of restoring the Kingdom is attained, *the more satisfactory* will be the solution of the world's history. In such an investigation Eschatology,[1] which embraces the re-establishment of the Kingdom, must necessarily stand forth with great prominence, seeing that *the end attained* serves to explain the causes in operation, the agencies employed, etc.[2]

[1] The prominence of Eschatology in the primitive Church was a key to former and then existing history, and it ought ever to remain such. Many unnecessary difficulties, many bitter controversies, many foolish questions and answers, would have been avoided had this *primitive key* been retained.

[2] It has long been felt by our greatest historians that the loftiest view of history is that which makes it centre in Jesus Christ. This is eminently true, seeing that for Him and by Him the successive ages have been created. This has been eloquently expressed by able pens, and we have been pointed to His being so pre-eminently a remarkable personage in the past, present, and the future—to the vast influence and power that He has and will exert, etc., but even a higher appreciation of this fact, constituting Him in fact (literally) the central figure in the world's history, is found in the re-establishment of the Theocratic Kingdom and His glorious reign. It teaches us that the Cosmos, which Humboldt admitted, notwithstanding its destructive agencies, was full of harmony, was far greater when viewed in the light of the Coming Christ to complete the Divine Plan. It is a remarkable feature, and well worthy of attention that the most powerful thinkers whose labors have even been detrimental (either directly or by perversion) to Christianity, yet observed such a striking truthfulness in the portrayal of Christ, in the fundamental ideas pertaining to Him, that they could not positively reject Him, as witnessed, for instance, in Kant, Schleiermacher, De Wette, Hase, Hegel, and many others, and even in a recent class like Renan, etc., who wish to preserve a historical or ideal Christ.

Obs. 1. Looking at *the end* as delineated in Holy Scripture and tracing *the provisionary* movements which lead to the portrayed result, we may say, in a sense different from Schelling, that "the whole of history is a divine revelation"; because *a divine ordering toward a specified end*, is manifest in all history.[1] This distinctive feature has been noticed even from a partial outlook in the fulfilment of certain predictions in the past and the present (so that the phrase "God in History" is a common one), but it becomes more significant, if we *anticipate* history as it will be writ-

ten *after* the covenanted Kingdom is once set up and realized. In the word of God we have (Twesten) a "manifestion of divine grace for the salvation of man"; in the individual believer we have a manifestation of such grace in bestowing the pledges and earnest of promised redemption; but in history, *as it will be*, we have a manifestation of the overruling Divine power by which the completed salvation, the perfected redemption, is fully accomplished. These briefly expressed hints are already sufficient to show us how important *anticipated history* is, to form a correct estimate of the history of the world. To describe a tree perfectly its fruit must be taken into account; to give an accurate description of a machine it must embrace not merely its several parts but the design or end for which it is intended; *precisely so* with an attempt to portray the world's history, for every effort which does not embrace the great end, the gracious design (and exhibited in this Kingdom) that God has in view, will utterly fail to do justice to the problems of history.[2]

[1] Hence Niebuhr, the historian, says: "It is not true that the study of history weakens our belief in divine providence; history is of all studies the one which tends to strengthen that belief." This is correct, provided an unprejudiced comparison is instituted between the facts of history and the Word of God.

[2] Such a position alone places us in the posture to see the provisionary measures adopted, to appreciate the wisdom of the means instituted, to measure the efficiency of initiatory forms, to unravel apparent inconsistencies, to decide between the evident antagonistic forces at work, to indicate the inevitable result following the long-continued conflict, etc. Instead of making God an imperfect Being (as Mill.) unable to control the world, or One who lacks benevolence toward His creatures, bringing misery and death upon all; instead of denying that a Being exists who sways a sceptre over all, and takes an abiding interest in man; this enables us to confide in Him as the Almighty, Good, and Merciful, who by *the end accomplished* vindicates His perfections, His rights, and His glory. Before man attempts to criticise God it is best for him to await *the ultimate result* of these preparatory dispensations. If the end is secured, as covenanted, predicted, and promised, *then* the wisdom, power, love, grace, etc., of God will be so conspicuously displayed that no one will be able to gainsay it; angels and men uniting in a vast demonstration of praise toward Him who has removed all mystery in the completion of salvation and in the perfected redemption of a world. The author of *The Ancient History of the East* in the pref. remarks: "I see in the annals of humanity the development of a providential plan running through all ages and all vicissitudes of society. In it I recognize the designs of God, permitting the liberty of man, and infallibly doing His work by their free hands, almost always without their knowledge, very often against their will. For me, as for every Christian, all ancient history is the preparation for—modern history the consequence of—the divine sacrifice of Calvary.' To this we add that both ancient and modern history are only preparative for the wider and grander results at the Sec. Advent of the once crucified One, to which all prophetic history points us. It is this Advent with its grand results that illuminates history, showing what the Divine Purpose intends to accomplish, bringing in an eventually world-wide Theocracy, a completed Salvation, a manifestation of God's glory, and the reflection of that glory in His creatures. It is this Advent with its redemptive agencies that enforces the fact that the Plan of Salvation and its provisions are the outgrowth of love and mercy flowing from the nature of the Eternal and Omnipotent One.

Obs. 2. History is imperfect and unsatisfactory unless some great accomplished fact, or work or condition is specified, and then the causes and manner leading to, and effecting the same are traced and delineated. This is true of biography, revolutions, national life, etc., and it is emphatically true of the most comprehensive of all histories, viz. that of the world. The question, then arises, what great leading (biblical) fact does the Word present for which all others are more or less preparatory. The answer is plain, it is found *in this Theocratic Kingdom* of the Messiah.

But to comprehend this fact, we must not confine ourselves to the past or to the present but also embrace the future, *the end contemplated by the Creator just as covenanted and predicted,* and then trace back through the several ages *the provisionary* causes working toward *the end designed.* A reasonable, Christian, philosophical history can only thus be produced. For then and only then will *a Divine Plan, a Divine Reason* appear, binding together into *a harmonious whole* what otherwise must lack coherency and form enigmas. *Then* the Bible will be found to contain the grand outlines of history, with here and there a particularizing ; and history will corroborate the existence of an overruling power pressing toward *a fixed, definite, pre-determined goal.* The Bible has accurately described the historical facts of the past, as numerous writers have shown. It does the same with present history. The reader will indulge a few remarks on this point. Men may by captious criticism endeavor to pick flaws in the past which is now beyond our personal cognizance, but if the Bible is as unreliable as they *claim and desire* to make it, why do they not find these *in present history*—a history more difficult to foretell and portray than that of the past, inasmuch as it is *more distantly removed* from the biblical writers. Here, if anywhere, contradictions ought to be found, and if found, they would have special weight, because coming under our personal observation. The unbeliever may take refuge in the past and urge assumption upon assumption, but we ask him, if correct in his position, to point out *a single solitary contradiction* existing between anticipated history and history realized *at the present day.* Thus, e.g. if the Jews were not a scattered people ; if Jerusalem were not in the possession of Gentile nations ; if the Church had not tares, divisions, trials etc. ; if wickedness did not abound ; if the Roman Empire was not divided, etc., *then* palpable contradictions would exist, and unbelief could triumph. But present history contains *no such adverse statements* invalidating the truthfulness of Holy Writ. Therefore, for this and other reasons, we hold implicit confidence in the history of the future as also given in the same unfailing Word ; which trust is especially confirmed by the remarkable and costly provision made for its realization in the Person of the Messiah. Thus taking the history of the future with that of the present and the past, reason perceives, and faith acknowledges, *a wonderful plan of redemption* extending from man's fall to his recovery, from Paradise lost to Paradise regained. This Plan assumes *definite form* in the Kingdom of God, and in the provisions instituted for its future realization. It evinces that God originally (Prop. 1) contemplated *a Theocratic* form of government even in the paradisiacal state (the only form of government consistent with God's relation to man); it shows how man in his present condition is utterly unfitted for such a government (trial having been made in Jewish history) ; it teaches how God is gathering out, here and there, from among all nations the material, the elements of strength, which when united and manifested at the determined period, will insure its success and perpetuity ; it declares, by the portraiture of the establishment of the Kingdom, how we are to regard the preparatory stages, the various dispensations, the Christian Church, the permission of evil, the temporary rejection of the elect nation, the existence of Gentile domination, etc. ; it brings forth Jesus Christ the Son of God and the Son of David, the promised Theocratic King as *the central figure* of history, both as the One to whom all history directs the heart of faith and the eye of hope, and as the One in whom history finds its *fulfil-*

ment and *solution;* and it pronounces *the Theocracy* as exhibited in the restored Davidic Throne and Kingdom then world-extended, *the highest expression* of Messianic power in behalf of a sin-cursed world, *the culmination* of a long series of merciful preparations, *the climax of Messianic dignity and glory* for which all things have been held in sufferance, abeyance, subjection, and compassionate trial.

The Theocratic order unmistakably teaches us that there is a Divine Providence overruling all things, even down to that dark end when Antichrist is allowed, for a brief space, to triumph, making victory and punishment the more signal and glorious. A plan gradually developed, consecutively followed, its progress toward completion assured, its end never lost sight of, all things tending toward its open manifestation in actual realization, and all this extending over thousands of years, may well cause us to reject Feuerbach's (*The Essence of Christianity*) declarations: "Religion is a dream of the human mind," "all theology is anthropology," declarations founded on *an exceeding limited* view of both history and the covenanted Divine Purpose. Unbelief is driven to singular positions, as illustrated e.g. in J. S. Mill (*Three Essays on Religion*), who, influenced by existing suffering and evil, and utterly unable to reconcile it, concludes that if there be a God that is good, *He must be limited in power.* This line of reasoning deals only with inferences and probabilities, and leaves *entirely untouched* the Divine Purpose as covenanted, as continuously unfolded, and ultimately consummated in the removal of evil and suffering; it is simply doing injustice to the Word, to past and present history, to the future as contained in God's Plan, and to J. S. Mill himself (for it is unworthy of his vigorous intellect) because it leaves out of its due connection a Personal Will manifesting itself in *a consecutive and historically revealed Plan.* The spirit inculcated e.g. in Gen. 50 : 20, will ultimately vindicate God from the misjudgment of men. When able men strive to construct a science of history as the result solely of natural law, leaving out a Divine Providence, etc., they simply elevate natural law above the Lawgiver. Such history *must necessarily* be imperfect, and when it is allied to a prejudice which denies the influence of the Bible on civilization (as shown by Bochart, Gale, Stillingfleet, Usher, Cudworth, Wines, Neander, Witsius, and many others), it becomes still more onesided and misleading. Just so soon as we lose sight of the scriptural conception of history and trace all to Naturalism, *then* we are adrift on a dark sea without compass or rudder—as evidenced by the varied and antagonistic views of the world's history given by such writers. Some of the efforts to construct a consistent history of the world are referred to in the art. "The Social Science; its History and Prospects" (*North Brit. Review*, Aug., 1851), but all such attempts are not sufficiently comprehensive in that the Theocratic idea, so full of light, is too much ignored or entirely misapprehended. It is true, as Wordsworth (quoted Lange's *Com. Zech.*, p. 69) said: "We speak of the connection of sacred and profane history; but what history can rightly be called profane? What history is there, rightly studied, which is not sacred? What history is there in which we may not trace the footsteps of Christ?" Glimpses of this are readily found in the allusions to and prophecies respecting Gentile nations in the Bible, as well as in the ultimate outcome.

Obs. 3. This Kingdom explains *why* only the briefest mention is made of Antediluvian history, and such prominency is given to Abraham's history; *why* Jewish history becomes such an important factor in the world's history, and *why* comparatively so little is said of Gentile nations in their national development.[1] It *enforces* the account of the creation of Adam and Eve; it *indorses* the fall of man and the consequent withdrawal of God; it *confirms* the depravity and rebellious spirit of the race; it *shows* the design of election and *why*, owing to postponement, the Kingdom was not realized; it *explains* the position of the Chr. Church and the intermingling of tares and wheat; and, in brief, it throws *light* upon all the great leading affairs, past and present and to come, which have a moulding and controlling influence in the world. As it is not within our purpose to enlarge upon these points, one may be selected to illustrate our meaning.

Take e.g. the creation of woman, which has been a standing jest among unbelievers, and viewed in the light thrown upon it by the Kingdom, it will be found related to and confirmed by the aspect of the Kingdom. Briefly (see my art. in *Proph. Times*, Feb., 1870, for a more extended notice), that there is something typical in this creation is plainly asserted by Paul, Eph. 5 : 23–32 ; not that the marriage relation as it indiscriminately exists is a type, but that the creation of Eve and the relation she was made to sustain to Adam (and to which the Apostle alone refers), is *a type* of the creation of an elect, chosen body of saints (who constitute the married wife, Prop. 127) and of the relation that they shall in the future sustain to the Second Adam.* We have (a) Adam who "is the figure of Him that was to come" (Rom. 5 : 14–21 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 45, etc.) ; (b) the sleep of Adam typical of the future sleep, i.e., death, Jno. 11 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 30, etc. ; (c) while Adam slept God "took one of his ribs" out of his side from which the woman was made, i.e. the fundamental part, etc., typical of what took place at the death of Jesus. "Rib" is symbolically used to denote a nation or people, so e.g. Barnes, *Com.*, Dan. 7 : 5. Now a people or nation is taken out of the side of Jesus when He slept ; for, just as that out of which the woman was made was taken out of the side of the first Adam, so that out of which the woman is formed or builded for the Second Adam is taken out of his side, and John *positively asserts* that he saw this, *John* 19 : 32–35. Now by this blood the sins of this people are remitted (Heb. 9 : 22), washed away (Rev. 1 : 5), and they are redeemed by it (Rev. 5 : 9), purchased by it (Acts 22 : 28), delivered as prisoners out of the pit (an allusion to the resurrection) by it (Zech. 9 : 11), sanctified by it (Heb. 13 : 12), etc. Thus as the first Adam slept that woman might be formed, so the Second Adam slept (died) "that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a peculiar people" (Tit. 2 : 14 ; 2 Cor. 5 : 15 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 5, 9). This blood is far-reaching, extending to the deliverance and manifested oneness in Christ *at* the resurrection, when this people shall be *publicly united* to the Second Adam *as His wife.* (d) After this "rib" was taken, God "closed up the flesh instead thereof." Only *one* woman is thus to be created for Adam, which is also intimated in "This is now bone," etc., which (according to Bush, *Com. loci*, and others), more correctly reads : "This is *for this time* or *this once* bone," etc., "implying that it was only on this occasion that woman was to come into being this way." More correctly, however, we would say that it implies that only for this time "*this once*" shall a woman thus derived bear a special, most intimate, and endearing relation to Him. One Eve was thus *specially* made for Adam, and according to the uniform testimony of Scripture there is one woman or people *peculiarly chosen and formed and specially* designed for the most *intimate union* with the Second Adam in the age to come, viz., *the married wife* as distinguished from the barren

---

* It has frequently been attempted to understand in a scientific way (Neander, *Ch. His.*, vol. 1, p. 586) the true significance of marriage as originally instituted. All acknowledge from Paul's language that some mystery is connected with it. Now, every effort from the Valentinian Gnosis down to the present, if guided by science alone, has proven a failure. It is only by following revelation and the early Patristic Chiliasm that we obtain *a clew* to a typical representation which relates to *the future* relationship of Christ and the Church. What Platonism, Ebionitism, Gnosticism, Montanism, etc., could not solve, divine truth in its fulfilment clearly places before us, showing *a deep significancy* in the peculiar, marvellous creation of woman.

woman (Prop. 118) restored and the virgins. While in the age to come the blessings of Christ as Redeemer will be most liberally and gloriously bestowed upon the restored Jewish nation (Prop. 114, etc.) and Gentile nations, yet it is also true that no other people will be thus signally honored as *the first-fruits, first-born;* for no others are thus taken and exalted with a kingship and priesthood, with a similitude and power like unto Christ's (Props. 86, 124, 130, 154). (e) "Made He woman" or (Bush and others) "Builded her to a woman;" with which compare Eph. 2 : 19–22; 1 Pet. 2 : 5, etc. (f) God "brought" (or presented) "her unto the man;" so the Father is the One through whom this woman or people is to be formed and presented to Christ. The sublime utterances of Jesus Himself in John, ch. 17, fully show this in Christ's acknowledgments that they are given to Him, etc. (g) Then "Adam said, This is now" (or "this once") "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh," etc. The apostle asserts the same in Eph. 5 respecting this chosen people and Christ, and this denotes far more than a mere spiritual union, viz., the elevation of this woman or people into *the most intimate relationship and oneness* with Christ in His manifested Theocratic ordering. They, as Peter says (2 Pet. 1 : 4), are made "partakers of the divine nature," by being made "like unto Christ," "who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body" ("like the body of His glory"), "we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him," etc. But sufficient has been stated to show that the ordering of the Kingdom indicates, that in the very creation of woman—in that it was brought about rather in the way stated than in any other—God had in view *a typical representation* of a "great mystery" (as Paul calls it) *to be realized in the Kingdom of God,* when "the helpmeet" (i.e. a help fit or suitable for Him) provided by the wonderful grace and power of God shall be *united with Jesus* to carry out the Divine Purposes. Or, if we take Prof. Bush's rendering this woman is "*an help as before him*" (i.e. one corresponding to him, one adapted to him, a counterpart of himself, etc.), which finds its counterpart in the association, companionship, coheirship, joint rulership, etc., of the saints with the Second Adam in His Kingdom, an exaltation graduated by that which the Son Himself, as David's Son, obtains.

The antediluvian world, as its fate testifies, was not favorable for a Theocratic ordering, and hence it was not attempted; Gentile nations, as their history indicates, could not be brought into the spirit and obedience requisite for such an ordering, and therefore it was not proposed to them; even the Jewish nation, so highly favored, God foreknew was lacking in qualifications (which was foretold), but God had a plan to overrule even this in mercy, and consequently the initiatory form was introduced. Bunsen (*Egypt*, 1, 23) says: "History herself was born on that night when Moses led forth his countrymen from the land of Goshen," but we prefer to locate it where God places its birth, viz., in the call and covenant with Abraham, linked as it is with what preceded and what follows. History is most intimately connected with the Bible. Moses has been called (Wines's *Com. Heb.*, p. 317) "the father of history." The Bible begins with no uncertain account of creation, or of the race, or of the fall, or of an entailed curse; and then it sweeps on, giving past and present history, and history in prophetic prospect, down through the ages until redemption is completed. History in its more particular or minute form begins with Abraham. His call is a remarkable epoch; so marked that the Bible gives *more place* to Abraham's history than to the antediluvian period. His faith could not have sprung from the idolatrous surroundings, and the covenants, so wondrously carried out in preparative measures and earnests of blessings, could not have originated with him. The bearing of the facts of his life, so far-reaching in results (to both Jew and Gentile) upon the world could not have been caused by mere natural causes. The placing of himself at the head of a nation, in the line producing the Christ,

etc., was not the operation of a human mind but of a divine will (comp. e.g. Max Müller, *Chips from a Ger. Workshop*, vol. 1, p. 373). Out of this call sprung forth the Theocratic idea, and its initiatory form in the Jewish Theocracy. And, let the reader mark it well, it was owing to this *Theocratic idea and rule* that the history of the Jewish nation alone assumes such prominence and importance in the eyes of the Almighty God (Prop. 154, etc.), while mighty nations and empires receive but the slightest notice. This, so objectionable and unaccountable to unbelievers, is decided proof of divine inspiration. For, instead of this feature originating in Jewish exclusiveness, it proceeds from the simple fact that as the Earthly Ruler of the nation, He must, in virtue of this relationship, manifest *a special interest* in the nation. Hence several of the distinctive peculiarities of the biblical history : (1) the circumstantial history of the nation until the Theocracy was established ; (2) the same continued during its existence ; (3) the same giving the causes of its removal ; (4) then the withdrawal of the records of events and the substitution of prophetic history with a few exceptions. The particular and the prophetic history, just as they are given, are needed, together with the Gospel history, to give us *a complete and perfect view* of God's Purpose in the re-establishment of the downfallen Theocracy. Everything relating to this idea, and essential to its comprehension, is carefully portrayed ; all else outside of it, is passed by or referred to as it may be effected by it. Hence the history of the Jewish nation even, outside of this Theocratic idea, has only the briefest prophetical delineation, such as is given to Gentile nations. God *shows respect* to His own Theocratic ordering, and when this Theocracy is restored again under David's Son, persons will wonder that this feature was so much overlooked or undervalued.

Obs. 4. Again, take the fall of man and the personal withdrawal of God. However the historical account may be explained, fact demonstrates the truthfulness of both, viz., that restraining influences are requisite to incline man to virtue and holiness, to moral law and order ; and that God is not personally present with man. So long as these facts exist, it is *folly* to deny them ; and unless a better explanation than that given in the Word to account for the introduction of such facts is presented (which has never yet been done), it is both *unwise* and *unsafe* to reject the Biblical statement on the subject. And the more so, seeing that the past and present history of the world introduces a multitude of additional corroborating facts, evolved by a Divine Plan for the removal of such a fall and the restoration of the personal Divine Presence. The Kingdom, in which the curse entailed by the fall is to be removed, necessarily must be considered in its detailed announcements (to see whether it is adequate to effect the same), and in its provisionary measures (to see whether the results contemplated will thus be reached). Hence to take the fall and view it as an isolated fact, briefly expressed, without observing *its connection* with history, is doing violence to Holy Writ ; true logical reasoning and impartial justice to the Word, will take up the Divine Plan thus far manifested, and especially as it will yet be realized, and regard the evidences which have for several thousand years accumulated in support of a previously announced statement and of the predictions relating to the future. To prove that the Biblical account is unworthy of confidence, let it be shown that the provisionary means instituted in and through Christ, and in and through this Theocratic arrangement (as it shall be manifested) are *inadequate* to produce the deliverance contemplated, and *then* an argument of vital strength will indeed be arrayed against the Word. While the Bible appeals to the fall of man as a fact that self-consciousness attests to, and that the history of the race abundantly confirms, it at the same time predicts (which is now so abundantly fulfilled) that men will arise and ignore this fall, decry the natural depravity of the race, reject with scorn the provisions made for its removal as unnecessary, laud and magnify the natural

ability of humanity to save and exalt itself, until the Perfectibility of Human Nature shall be endorsed and advocated by the multitude. The testimony of all nations, savage and civilized, to a sense of sin and guilt, of religious needs, mediation, sacrifice, prayer, etc., and the evidence of a Word fortified by the evolution of a regularly constituted and carried-out Plan, are by many, even now, regarded as proofs of superstition. But such conclusions invariably are based on isolated, detached, and fragmentary objections, lacking force and power, because not founded on *a comprehensive view* of the history (past, present, and future) of the race as given in the Word. Men endeavor to find flaws in this or that link in a connected chain of Divine Purpose, without regarding either the relation that one link sustains to its comrades and to the whole, or the design intended by its Maker in forming such a united chain. To avoid misapprehension, let it be added: While the Bible insists upon the depravity of man, yet at the same time it also states that such is his condition, mental, moral, and physical, that God still deemed him worthy of redemption, and in the determination of such redemption and the provision made for it through Jesus Christ elevated man to a position of dignity which he is now at liberty either to retain, confirm, and enlarge (viz., by the reception of Christ), or to degrade and forever forfeit (viz., through the rejection of proffered salvation). The establishment of this Kingdom (in the kingship and priesthood of the saints, in the restored happy condition of the elect Jewish nation, and in the rich blessings bestowed upon Gentile nations) vindicates the dignity (bestowed by grace) of man, exhibiting his capacity for (advanced by love) and enjoyment of its privileges, honors, and happiness.

The student is also reminded that, owing to our limited intelligence, we will find in the history of the world, as well as in nature and in the Scriptures, mysteries. It is utterly impossible for any one to form a consistent whole unless admitting that he does this "by faith," the same faith that finds God, His Christ, and the Spirit. Faith elevates us to the Ruler of all things and causes us to unite the world with its Creator just as the Bible asserts. Dr. Sprecher (*The Wittenberger*, Oct., 1877) refers to this when advocating "the Christian idea of the universe of things," and that "the unavoidable is not the result of blind force, but the words of conscious mind and intelligent thought," so that "the necessary and the unavoidable is the determination of infinite reason, and is directed to a rational end," and from this argues, notwithstanding the mysteries connected therewith, the relationship that we sustain to that Will. There is only one solution, and that contained in the Bible, to the evils of the world, to the removal of the curse, to the enigmas of regeneration puzzling the minds of statesmen and others; this is found in the Second Advent of "the Christ," and its related truths, especially the one pertaining to the Kingdom. The six thousand weary and sad years of humanity, bound in a curse and adding to its horrors by the effects of wilful wickedness, are designed to teach man that he needs *Theocratic* help in the Person and Power of the Theocratic King, Jesus the Christ—the earnest now, the perfect realization hereafter. Faith holds fast to this hope.

Obs. 5. This Kingdom throws additional light upon the problem of evil, and if ever a correct Theodicy is formed, it must be based upon *the Theocratic ordering* as it will ultimately be realized. The reader must place himself in that period when the Kingdom is restored, and all the blessings forfeited are more than regained under the reign of the Messiah and His brethren, and then, too, he must look back upon the past few thousand years with something of that largeness of the Spirit's apprehension of time (for with God those thousands of years, so long to man, are as days, or as

"a moment"), and then look forward to the long, long-continued, ever-enduring prosperity to which the introductory thousands of years form the briefest of episodes. This narrows down the prevalence of sin and the provisionary means to overrule it to a narrow space of time; it brings in numerous reasons in justification of the goodness and wisdom of God over against the allowance of sin and misery; it extends our views of the expression of the Divine Will, of God's design in glorifying Himself, of securing man's happiness, of bringing forth a higher state of things through mercy and love. It vindicates the fact that originally God did bestow happiness upon man, which was forfeited through his own moral agency, and that He will yet bestow happiness upon man (excepting to those who wilfully reject it) after a brief—very brief in the light of the ages to come—*provisionary* period has expired. It evinces then the transient nature of evil; that sin, so far as the race is concerned, is only temporary, and that its dominion under the Theocratic rule will be *forever* crushed. It also teaches that sin was not a *necessary* means to accomplish the greatest good, but that God in spite of sin (resulting from the determination of man's free moral agency) so *overrules* it that great good results, for man restored under the Theocracy shows that sin was not *requisite* in his case to attain unto so high and noble a destination, but rather that he gained it over against sin through extended mercy and love, seeing that that which sin marred called for *special* interposition and provision, and that sin itself will finally be put down by a terrible exhibition of supernatural power and vengeance. The Kingdom re-established, when "all shall be righteous," etc., here on earth, proves that sin is no necessity in the government of God; that it can and shall be effectually crushed as a disturbing element, originating in an allotted freedom to man. A remarkable feature is also developed by the rewards and stations in this Kingdom, viz., that evil itself, brought upon man by himself, is made *disciplinary*, and that grace, in the proper endurance of the same, will even thus make it a source of benefit in the *testing* and *elevation* of character. In view of man's free moral agency (the God-given power of choice), evil is permitted and entailed both as *a punishment* (to magnify the majesty of law and the danger of sin) and as *a means* (overruled as such) for good (to arrest and lead to the acceptance of Redemptive purpose, etc.). Hence, that which God depreciates and forbids in man, and which He threatens to punish with severity, is allowed (Rom. 9 : 22, etc.), in *mercy* toward man, because it could even be made subservient to his discipline and punishment, and it could be finally rooted out without detriment to the Divine character, thus displaying His wonderful power and love *in safely tolerating* (it being against Himself) it, for a time, and then in effectually destroying it. Finally, this Kingdom teaches us in its astonishing Theocratic arrangements (e.g. in the gathering and association of the saints as joint rulers, etc.) that sin and its consequent evils in the world will only be endured *until* a sufficiency of moral and religious power (in the persons of the elect) is gathered out to insure *an overwhelming, triumphant, and perpetual ascendency of a pure Theocratic government* over all the earth, and then sin and evil are doomed to descend from their ascendency and forever perish. Looking at the world's history, not disconnectedly (as at the separate, detached parts of a machine), but connectedly, and especially at the grand end to which it is destined under a pure, powerful, beneficent Theocratic rule by "the man ordained"

through "the Father of mercies"—then instead of having a world like that described by Carlyle (*Latter-Day Pamphlets*) sinking to ruin and satisfied with the hopeless mockeries of government and religion; or, like that represented by Froude (*The English in Ireland*, vol. 3, p. 1–4), constantly passing through "the long toil of reconstruction," ever repeated, we have a world redeemed, freed from the curse, and restored to more than its former Paradisaical state.

All the points enumerated in this and preceding observations are studiously ignored by unbelief, and hence the deductions (as e.g. Mill's, Obs. 2, note 1) that are presented to the lowering of Scripture authority. Our doctrine necessarily makes much of the historical connection of the Plan of Redemption. While holding forth the Plan itself, it also appeals to the facts of history, past and present, and from the provisionary aspects thus attested to, supports faith and hope in the ultimate completion. Spiritualism, mysticism, materialism, etc., close their eyes to *both* the Plan and the historical attestation, and such a mode of procedure, coming from cultivated minds, indicates a certain "*willingness*" to engage in this onesided consideration. Science has led some of the deepest thinkers, who reject and refuse to follow the spiritual teachings of the Word, to refuse the idea of a foreknown intelligent design and plan in the production of material nature leading to the acknowledgment of a wisdom, will, etc., in a personal Creator. It may well be asked, will not such allow the existence of a purpose, indicative of the same, in the past and present history of the world as foreshown by prophecy, and the preparatory measures instituted to fulfil covenant, and as realized by history. Here certainly is a wide field for reason, if it will only calmly and dispassionately enter its domains—not with a predetermined judgment, but with an unbiassed, unprejudiced mind. We do not then need to occupy the position of Hume, who (as quoted by an anon. writer, *Proph. Times*, vol. 6, p. 6) remarks respecting the suffering and evils of the world: "The whole is a riddle, an enigma, an inexplicable mystery. Doubt, uncertainty, suspense of judgment, appear the only result of our most accurate scrutiny concerning this subject." Fully admitting that we now must, in the nature of the case, see through a glass, darkly, and that God now hides Himself in Providence as in nature, yet certain great landmarks are given, within whose limits we find rest to our souls, peace to our minds, and hope to our hearts. The amplitude of evidence respecting the Divine Purpose, supported by a personal experience derived from faith in Jesus, gives us the assurance and confidence that evil is temporary, and will, in God's own good time be blotted out of this world. The gradual preparation is going on, and when Jesus comes again *the consummation* will be witnessed; and then, too, it will be vividly realized that the history of the world evidences the fulfilment of a Divine Plan, which, without interfering with the freedom and accountability of man, issues ultimately, as promised, into *a glorious perfected Redemption*, to which grand result evil itself, both individual and national, is permissively allowed, in order that, consistently with man's freedom, Providence and Grace, Wisdom and Love, may evolve the preparation necessary for so great a fruitage, and eternally fix through the ceaseless ages the affections of those who once felt the curse and experienced deliverance. Many are now disposed to revive and modernize the old Stoical theory that "evil is absolutely necessary in the order of the world as the shadow is to the light," etc., but our doctrine of ultimate complete deliverance (as well as the original creation, the work and sacrifice of Jesus, and God's hatred to sin) clearly shows that it is unnecessary, that it pertains to an imperfect state, that it is only now permitted to exist for wise purposes, and that it will be so overruled as to promote the honor and praise of God, the Redeemer.

Obs. 6. Much is said respecting progress, and the praises of Perfectibility are loudly proclaimed by rationalistic, naturalistic, and mystical advocates. But the history of the world down to the Second Advent shows that *God's estimate* of human nature is the *only correct one*. Progress there is; progress in the developing of the Divine Purpose; progress in the fulfilment of prediction; progress in the gathering out of the elect; progress in knowledge of all kinds, etc., but a decided and general progress in the highest of all things, securing world ascendency, viz., in true piety, will

evermore be lacking. The history of the Antediluvian era, of the Jewish nation, of Gentile nations, of great Empires, of the early Christian churches, of this dispensation culminating in the widespread wickedness of the last days, are painful evidences of advancement and retrogression, of progression and stagnation, and finally of positive general unbelief, irreligion, and enmity. Human nature—such is the sad lesson—remains *the same down to the end of the age.* The lessons of the past and present; even the exhibition of unspeakable love in the provision made for salvation; the tears, sufferings, and death of a Saviour; the bright and glorious prospects opened before repentance and faith, fail to impress *the race* with a proper sense of moral obligation and allegiance enforced by gratitude and love. This calls for that *long-delayed but surely coming* wrath and vengeance of Almighty God. But while human nature in the aggregate remains the same, God has been constantly preparing for the enforcement of His decree, by gathering out *a portion* of the race to form *the nucleus* of a restored Kingdom of power which will shine forth with great glory after the lighting down of sore trial and postponed wrath upon the last embodiment (Props. 160–163) of human wickedness. *Then* will it clearly appear that this long series of repeated depravity, finally culminating in the Antichrist, was *only permitted* in order that during this period this distinctive and peculiar people of God, designed for coheirship with Jesus the Christ, *might be formed* for the Theocratic Kingdom.

Prophecy, as has been noticed, finds its proof not so much in considering isolated predictions (as e.g. those referring to nations, cities, or even to Christ) as in a clear historical development in accord with it, and in a continuous unfolding of the Divine Purpose culminating in the Person of Christ, not only as to the past but much more as to the future, who is to perfect it. This, no doubt, has had its influence upon many minds, such e.g. as Ewald's. (A liberal writer in the *Westm. Review*, July, 1874, p. 98, amusingly refuses to acknowledge the advances of Ewald as follows: "Ewald clearly shows, in spite of his sympathies on many points with the Rationalists, that he is still at bottom a Supernaturalist, admitting as he does a specific distinction between the prophetic revelation of Israel and that of other nations.") Prophecy simply teaches us what history will be in the future; it does not itself make history, for that which gives prophecy—a power more potent than prophecy—makes history, either directly or permissively. Hence we cannot receive the opinion of Myers (*Present Day Papers*), who makes prophecy not "to be conceived of under the image of history thrown from the future upon the present, but rather under that of a prominent principle continually reproducing itself in the future." This does not sufficiently discriminate between prophecy as recorded, and the power that bestows prophecy; it is the latter that vindicates the former, and the fulfilment of the former indicates that *the Supernatural* has given it. Besides this, much of prophecy is given not merely to foretell future events, but to inform us how and when certain things pertaining to the Divine Purpose are to be realized, and, therefore, is a portrayal of what *God* will do to carry out His Plan. It is thus the revelation of God's will and design.

Obs. 7. This Kingdom realized, throws light upon the doctrine of atonement and its relationship to the history of the world. It is unnecessary to dwell upon that feature which Biblical, Systematic, and Dogmatic Theology has so fully and ably discussed, viz., how the death of Jesus, the shedding of His blood, is conducive to the remission of the sins of the believer. It is only our object to designate a few things, *too much overlooked*, which, in the knowledge of this Kingdom, were affected by His death. Our entire argument unmistakably evinces that Jesus died, among other reasons, in order *to fulfil* the covenants (vide, e.g. Prop. 50). For when He came and tendered the Kingdom on condition of repentance and

the nation refused to repent, and He was rejected (Prop. 57), it became *necessary* to provide both a sacrifice for the nation (that it should not utterly perish), and for Gentiles (that they might by repentance and faith in His blood be brought into the adopted line). This was affected by the voluntary offering of Jesus, so that through it God's forbearance and love could be manifested *in continuing* (against the sinfulness of the nation and world) *His gracious purpose to fulfil the covenants.* It is a matter of profound amazement, that the greatest preparation for such a fulfilment is made in a manner that, humanly speaking, *seems* to defeat it, viz., by His death. But its necessity and eminent fitness is evidenced, not merely in the manner already intimated, but by the results flowing from it, for "He died for our offences and was raised for our justification." Jesus and the apostles justly unite the death and the resurrection, ascribing to the latter evidence that the former was not endured in vain. Now let us see what the Kingdom gains by the union of this death and resurrection *in the way of fulfilling* the covenant promises of God. By this death and resurrection Jesus Christ as David's Son becomes the covenanted immortal, glorified Son of David. He gives the highest possible expression of obedience to the Divine Will; and He that has thus obeyed is worthy also to reign. By these He gains power over death, so that He is able to deliver His own from the prison house at the time appointed. These constitute Him a King worthy of all love, for the Theocratic King, the King of glory died and was raised to deliver His coheirs and subjects. By these He, as David's Son, is made worthy of, yea perfect for (so the Scriptures, Prop. 84), the exalted Theocratic position. His death and resurrection are the pledges or evidence, if we will receive them, that the covenants will be *most amply realized;* for by the same we have not only the perpetuation of the Jewish nation and final restoration insured, the door of faith opened to Gentiles, the gathering out of a seed unto Abraham manifested, but we have the Theocratic fitness, the immortality, the resurrecting power of the Son of Man *fully vindicated,* constituting Him the One predicted, able to perform the promises of God, and bring deliverance, at His Coming, to a sin-burdened and groaning world. His death and resurrection are the two most noted events that history thus far records, and they form *the real basis* of past, present, and coming history, inasmuch as *they show* that through the provision made by them all history thus far has been possible, and that future history, as represented in the Word by anticipation, will exist.

The question is sometimes asked why God does not reveal Himself to a nation as He did to Israel; why He does not personally communicate with man as He once did. The answer, from our position, is plain and decisive. Because no nation occupies *a Theocratic* relationship; when this is restored *then* He will again be present and accessible. Until a people is prepared for a Theocratic ordering, the dignity and honor of the Mighty One refuses such a personal communication. Preparatively He only reveals Himself in and through faith, training a people for *the coming revelation* of Himself. But the time is near when God will again reveal Himself and dwell with man in the Person of Jesus the Christ. The prevailing idea of many writers is to make the incarnation the greatest event in history (as e.g. by Dr. Nevin in Mercersburg Theology, Dr. Turnbull in *Christ in History,* etc.), and this certainly cannot be eulogized too highly, seeing that through it the means are provided for the fulfilment of the covenants. But even this should not be allowed to overshadow the glorious manifestation of this humanity in the future, and the Kingdom resulting therefrom. Dr. Schaff (*His. Apos. Church,* Introd., Sec. 39) says: "Christ is *the centre and turning-point,* as well as *the key* of *all* history." This is eminentlyt true, for history before the First Advent is introductory to Him; history after this Advent is preparatory to His future manifestation as Theocratic King; history, both past

and present, has a constant reference in its ultimate import to Him. So Lange (*Com.*, Introd. to Genesis, p. 5) makes "the one pervading theanthropic subject of Holy Scripture, Christ and the Kingdom of God." Numerous writers, however they may explain this Christ and Kingdom, take the same position, and a comparison of the whole Bible, Old and New Tests., inevitably enforces such a conclusion. The culmination of all, the explanation of all, is found in the Christ and His Kingdom.

Obs. 8. It has become very fashionable, both in theological and scientific circles, to associate almost everything with "the Universe," imitating the inflated style of Orientalism, which imagines that things are honored and exalted in proportion to the application of high-sounding words. Some works teem on almost every page with such wide-sweeping phraseology, that if we were to credit them, the Son of Man died for the Universe and was destined to reign in the Covenanted Kingdom over the Universe. We find nothing of the kind in Holy Scripture. He died for man, for this world, to redeem it, and in this world the Christ, David's Son, is to reign in the promised Kingdom. Such language arises from mistaking the sovereignty of the Logos with the Father for *the covenanted* Kingdom, Prop. 79, 80, and 81. The history of Jesus as *Theocratic King* is united with the future history of this world. Having under various Propositions fully established this; and also that, by means of this Theocratic reign, this world shall be brought into harmonious relationship to the Universe, it is sufficient to ask theologians and writers to consider that the Bible very pointedly *confines itself*, almost exclusively, to the history of this world, to the fall, the intermediate period, and the recovery, and has but little to say concerning the Universe so persistently paraded by men. When the status, destiny, etc., of the earth is comprehended, it will be time to receive the labored conjectures respecting the Universe. While neither of them can be passed by, we are more directly interested in the earth and its Redemption. The history of the earth is revealed; the history of a Universe is not designed, even in its broadest possible outlines, in the Bible; and it is therefore passing *beyond* the Record to ascribe to the Universe what really and truthfully belongs to our own known world. The temptation of presenting illustrations upon this point is resisted, lest we might be charged with caricaturing men whom we love and esteem. A mere mention is sufficient for the wise and prudent. While it is proper and necessary to introduce the Universe itself, it is highly objectionable to give it the prominency mentioned.

The Plan of Redemption reconciles this world to the universe, and opens the way of access to it. When this world is brought under Theocratic rule, when the curse is repealed and Satan bound, when the renewal and restitution are effected, *then* the knowledge of the universe will be immeasurably increased. Science, divinely directed and under the protection of those who no longer see through a glass darkly, refined and purified under the reign and power of glorified beings, becomes the hallowed, cherished handmaid of faith, hope and love, and aids in swelling the praises of God and His Christ.

Obs. 9. In such a conception of the world's history, including a view of the whole from the beginning to the end, from the provisionary to the completed design, we have confirmed the statements made by comparative theology when non-partisan (as e.g. in the hands of Max Müller, *Science of Religion*, etc.). This Kingdom embraces, as our argument shows, the deliverance of man, as man, from the thraldom in which he is now placed.

But this itself asserts the superiority of man, his origin as given in the Word, and his capabilities for a high destiny. Scientific research, thus conducted, after the primitive man, corroborates what the Bible appeals to as a subsidiary witness, viz., that man—all men—in every age, however sunken or advanced, degraded or civilized, has exhibited a moral, a religious, an intellectual nature above that of the mere physical and animal, which constitutes him the noblest of God's creatures on earth, eminently worthy (evidenced and increased by the death of Jesus in his behalf, which proclaimed him in the light of moral law unworthy, and yet, in the light of God's love and as God's own special creation, worthy in view of his capacity, etc.) of the scheme of Redemption instituted for his recovery. The provisionary means toward this Kingdom constantly refer to *the truthfulness* of even "Natural Religion," exhibited in the varied forms of religion and in the outcroppings of truth, doctrine, and feeling, springing from the constitution and surroundings of man, so that the commendation of the Word of God finds *its response* in the heart of man itself. Science, as the writings of eminent men abundantly testify, establishes the moral and religious nature of man, the unity of the race, the abiding sense of God, the consciousness of dependence and accountability—in brief, the existence of all those great leading religious ideas which form *the basis* of a receptive revelation and of man's adaptedness for advancement (with the promised aid) in the way of salvation. The advances made in science (used onesidedly by a growing class in hostile attack upon the Bible) are by many thoughtful men (as e.g. Dr. Ulrici in *God and Nature*) deemed confirmatory of God, being made the postulate of physical science. Valuable works from various sources come laden with the fact, that all truth illustrates and corroborates what the Bible insists upon as most reasonable, viz., faith in God, and in a God of the Bible as therein presented. For truth is never isolated; it belongs to a grand system, and when deep thinking men come to place this or that truth in the connection which it sustains to the whole, then inevitably comes also the notion of *the Infinite* who has established the truth, made as responsive to it, etc. But while even science teaches *how rational* it is to reject that gross materialism, which allies man in his early history with the brute, and severs him from accountability to a moral governor—*how reasonable* it is to refuse credence to that rationalism which confines itself to a natural development of religious ideas without acknowledging the Higher Power which has thus constituted the capability of development, and the right of such a Power to command and to be obeyed—*how just* it is to pass from the law to the Lawgiver and not to make the latter subordinate to the former—yet with all this confirmatory evidence (corresponding as we have seen with the doctrine of the Kingdom, both in the provision for, and in the final establishment of, the Kingdom), *much more, immensely more*, is needed to reveal how man's necessities can be met and man's salvation can be secured. This is revealed alone in Holy Scripture. The Divine Purpose in relation to man, to the institution of law, and the present arrangement of the world, is alone found in Holy Writ; and science, philosophy, in brief, all real knowledge derived outside of that Word, only establishes that the facts in the constitution of man, of law, and of the world, are such as to make such a Purpose *necessary, reasonable, and eminently worthy* of a Creator, Preserver, Benefactor, and Redeemer. And may we add, that as the lesser or subordinate ought always to be regarded in the light of the higher or

superior, so the deductions of science—all knowledge outside of the Word—ought always to be considered in the light of *a constantly developing and finally completed Divine Purpose.* Surely in this, as the all-wise God Himself teaches us, *is true wisdom.*

There is an undercurrent of sadness, of utter hopelessness, that appeals to our hearts in the writings of some unbelievers. It is found in that class of sceptics who, amid the grave doubts and deductions of reason, deplore their own lack of faith in the future, and regret that they have nothing better to substitute in place of the one deemed overthrown. It evidences at least a misguided sincerity, which strongly calls for sympathy. Even such, however, endeavor (as e.g. Hennell in *An Inquiry concerning the Origin of Christianity*) to comfort themselves by "indulging the thought that a time is appointed when the cravings of the heart and of the intellect will be satisfied, and the enigma of our own and the world's existence be solved" (quoted by Owen in *Deb. Land*, p. 160). The time appointed by God is overlooked, the agencies prepared for that time are ignored, the Divine Purpose which embraces such a time remains unconsidered, and the result follows, viz., that *no intelligent faith and hope*, based on the past and present history of the world as manifesting the gradual but sure development of God's Redemptive Plan, can be entertained and expressed. Men will, however, deliberately and intentionally close their eyes to any delineation of divine purpose. Even the influence, past and present, exerted by the Jewish and Christian religion and theology is passed by without special notice. Thus e.g. *why* does Herbert Spencer in his system of philosophy based on evolution and framed by an alleged inductive plan omit this theological aspect? *Why* must his system ignore such an important element, having so wide an influence over man and nations, having so regular a development sustained by well-known historical progression? What answer can we possibly give? Spencer strives after a certain unity (an intellectual necessity) and centres it in the Unknown, but the Bible, without such an effort to build up a system of philosophy, does far more when it brings all to *the Will of a personal God*, and centres it in *the Knowable.* The former, after all, is mere inference, while the latter, owing to origin and continuity, to design and purpose, finds its proof in self-consciousness and reason. Prof. Adler in "The Evolution of Hebrew Religion" (*Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Sept., 1876) says that "scientific inquiry" has concluded "that the transmission of historical information had in no wise been the object of the Hebrew writers" (of the Pentateuch); and that the Bible is no "text-book of history." But this position we can reasonably expect from a man who receives the Bible as he does Homer; who manifests his prejudice by seeking out discrepancies, and who comes to it biassed by a previously constructed history of his own. Every step evinces an evident anxiety to discredit its statements by substituting the so-called deductions of science; and the objections, so abundantly answered by apologists, are repeated as if never met. Schopenhauer in *The World regarded as a Manifestation of Will*, utterly denies the origin and continuance of the world under a Personal God and Divine Government, and hence history is only a description of human wretchedness, pain, misery, and ever-returning suffering. Life is undesirable; to be born is a misfortune; to marry, and be the means of introducing new life is an unworthy action, seeing that it only perpetuates sorrow and torture; living beings end in man, for no superior Being would allow such a wretched comedy or tragedy to exist; to long for annihilation, to believe in no future existence under any form, to die and that to be the end of all is the noblest philosophy and best support. Such a view of history and the destiny of man is the result of gloom, despair, unreason, and from which unbelief itself so largely recoils. Hartman in the *Philosophy of the Unconscious* sees nothing but evil preponderating in the world; no divine plan or all-powerful God is overruling to a beneficent end; in this the best of possible worlds wretchedness prevails; philosophy teaches the sad fact that existence is a curse; that man is deluded by false hopes to cling to that existence; that such hopes prompted by instincts are a blessing in that they finally, through progress, reveal the utter misery of his state; that the highest desire is to wish for the annihilation of self and others; that enlightenment of our state only brings disgust and a desire to be rid of it; that a true knowledge of our real condition will in the future precipitate fearful catastrophes and loss of life; that the future threatens—as a blessing—annihilation as the end of all woe, for religions, progress, the notion of future life, etc., are illusions imparting vain hopes. He, however (like Mill, etc.), constructs a God or Power that lacks ability to control the evil, remove it, etc., and hence, logically (from his standpoint) leads on the world to its destined end, annihilation. In even allowing a Creator of a world of wretchedness, he gives us, to save this Creator's honor, an "unconscious" God. To avoid an alleged "absurdity" he

plunges *into one that is greater.* Take the God of the Bible and contrast it with Hartman's God, and the One is *Light,* while the other is *darkness.* Take the biblical account of the evil and misery of the race, with the design connected with provisionary means, of ultimate release, and contrast it with his declarations, and the one imparts hope of deliverance, while the other gives nothing but despair. We repeat : the creation of the world and its races, its evils and antagonisms, its fearful experiences from nature and man, its repeated stages and changes involving terrible suffering, etc., would form an inexplicable mystery if it were not for *the light of the Bible,* presenting a connected and sustained redemptive scheme, holding forth a definite and magnificent end worthy of such a Creator and creation. Contemplating not merely the preparatory stages in their ascending scale, but *the great End* which brings praise, honor, and glory to God and His Christ, we find the key—which philosophy and reason outside of this can never obtain—to the world's sad history.

PROPOSITION 195. *This doctrine of the Kingdom may, analogically, give us a clew to the Government of other worlds.*

The astronomical idea of the vast plurality of worlds (which Paine and others so offensively parade over against the reasonable representations of Newton, Boyle, Bacon, Chalmers, Fuller, Brewster, etc.) is in all probability the correct one. The Scriptures dealing almost exclusively with man and this world, still indirectly, by speaking of intelligences outside of this world and by various references to the creative power of God, the magnitude of His work, etc., make the view a consistent one. Such worlds inhabited by rational creatures are necessarily under the moral government of God. This is admitted by all, but we go a step beyond by adding, also under *the civil government* of God. For, considering how God institutes government here and perfects it, we may, from analogy, draw the inference that other worlds are also governed by similar *Theocratic* government; God in each case condescending to act as *the specific world ruler*. In this way two important objects are attained: (1) a desirable *Unity* in the universe is obtained and (2) the *happiness* of each world is secured.

In reference to other worlds being inhabited, it seems to the writer that a consideration of Isa. 45 : 18 is amply sufficient to justify such an opinion. In declaring that God formed, made, and established the earth, it is added: "*He created it not in vain* (or, *to be empty*), *He formed it to be inhabited.*" Here the reason assigned for creating a world is specifically given, viz., that it may be the dwelling-place of living creatures. It is most unreasonable to suppose that the numerous worlds, some of immense size, are formed in order to remain empty. The Omnipotence of God, His creative power, is certainly not only employed in filling the heavens with ponderous insensible bodies, utterly incapable of appreciating His glory and majesty intelligently. He places upon these, therefore, as upon the earth, creatures with reason and moral powers capable of showing forth His praise and enjoying the blessings flowing from creative goodness.

Obs. 1. It is true that this Theocratic arrangement by which God and man are brought into union and fellowship is one instituted in a fallen world, and a peculiarity, distinguishing it from others, may exist in the union of God with David's Son for *Redemptive* purpose. But *the Theocratic idea*, God ruling, is prominently preserved, so that where Redemption is not needed, it alone exists in the form in which it would have existed if man had not fallen, or in that form evinced before the Theocratic-Davidic order. That is, in each world God is the recognized Ruler of the same, either directly by communications given by Himself, or by some Agent or Agents taken into special union with Himself. The isolation of each world from all others (without forbidding intercommunication with heavenly beings), and the necessity of having law and order with its resul-

tant for each one separately (without ignoring the common bond which thus binds them into one grand whole), make this Theocratic arrangement available for *the highest and noblest society* of creatures that exist in any of the planets. It may even suggest, how, if other creatures have fallen like man, this Theocratic idea can be made *available* in their case by the union of the Divine with a sinless being connected with a fallen race thus forming a bond of inseparable union between God and the race. And for aught we know this bond may exist in Jesus Christ, who as God-man, related to fallen humanity, may in virtue of His obedience, etc., be the Saviour proclaimed for other worlds, if indeed a Saviour is needed, simply on the ground that the proclamation of the sacrifice made for sin through Him is sufficient to teach a Universe the sublime nature of law, of sin, the necessity of having a Mediator, etc. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether other worlds need Redemption like ours, and as the subject is one of pure speculation, it may be dismissed with the single remark, that unfallen or fallen, the very relationship of the creature to the Creator, presupposes some such order of government, and as we only know how our world is to be governed, viz., in the Theocratic form, it is natural to suppose that others will likewise be thus controlled.

To avoid misapprehension and the charge of making thus many Christs (which we expressly guard against), we may properly explain more fully our meaning, which is this: While the Divine-Human in the person of Jesus Christ is specifically, in virtue of the covenanted seed, appointed to reign here on the earth, we do not and dare not limit the divine in its sweep and manifestations over and in any part of the universe (Props. 79 and 80). This is illustrated by the presence of the divine even now everywhere, and which was characteristic of it even when David's Son was living here on earth. Besides, this part of the subject is given not as a dogmatic truth, but as an interesting speculation. In this view the phrase "only-begotten Son" may refer to the fact that He is revealed as such to our world without limiting the power of *the divine* in Him as to other worlds. The reader will notice, as a matter worthy of reflection, that Jesus has the Kingdom most specifically promised to Him as to His humanity (Props. 81, 82), because the divine in the Theocratic idea is something that in the very nature of a Theocracy is taken for granted. The unbeliever says that it is inconceivable that when other worlds also need a Saviour that God should send His Son to this world alone. Chalmers, it is said (by a writer in *North Brit. Review*, May, 1854, p. 7), "has rather cut than untied the knot, when he expresses the opinion that the inhabitants of these worlds may not have required a Saviour." It is contended that creatures living in worlds of matter, subject to material laws, will not be "exempt from sin, suffering, and death." But this does not follow legitimately, unless it can be shown conclusively that Adam and Eve must, *of necessity*, have fallen under the curse. We see abundant provision made to secure their immortality, and the divine record impresses us with the belief that had they remained innocent, the mortal would have been swallowed up in life by access to the tree of life. On the other hand, admit that such creatures likewise endure probation and a fall, the writer referred to argues that just as Christ's death extended in its divine influence and healing back to the past and forward in the future, to all lands, to all men, so it may extend to all places needed in the universe; its beneficence may not be limited, and its manifestations of love and mercy may not be satisfied short of the extension of sin and need of redemption. But we need not Origen's ultra view, which makes the starry world, living beings, animated by souls, subject to vanity and corruption, and also desiring release.

Obs. 2. The Will of God done on earth as it is in heaven, evinces the fact that it is only performed or carried out when nations *are thus Theocratically* governed; and hence, that the Divine Will *favors* such a form of government, as being correspondent with heaven itself. Now, if God thus *identifies* Himself with so small a world in the interest and happiness of

His creatures, and even condescends to a relationship with humanity through David's Son to cause the Will of God to be done on earth as in heaven, we may readily conclude that He will not be *less identified* with other worlds in a form of government similar in kind, modified to suit the peculiar status of the creature, and influenced, if need be, by the special manifestation of it here in the person of Jesus Christ. Small as this world is, it is undoubtedly true, seeing the interest angelic beings are represented as taking in it, that the Redemptive work of God in Christ causes, in view of the principles and amazing love involved, the most profound sensation and feeling *wherever* made known in the Universe. The happy illustration used by some writers of a rebellious province, small in territory as it may be, affecting the general welfare, can be greatly extended if we allow *the perpetuity* of this Theocratic order in a constantly visible and now accessible (i.e. to other worlds, vide below, Obs. 4) salvation. The manner in which it was affected, and is continued forever, closes the door to the dreary thought of rebellion, and forever secures, through the noblest of motives, *the heartfelt allegiance* of all intelligences. The Universe cannot but esteem this world as *a wonderful theatre*, because of the actors engaged in it, the government of God involved in it, the astonishing results wrought out in it ; and to estimate with any degree of correctness its *vast influence*, we must wait until the work is completed, and the hosts of God rejoice with us in perfected Redemption. Of one thing we may rest assured, that because of its vital relationship to the honor and glory of God and of His Son and of the Spirit, it will *be made known* wherever the government of God extends, both to glorify God and to benefit the creature.

Dr. Sprecher (*Groundwork Theol.*, p. 36, etc.) has some fine thoughts respecting this world being a moral nursery to prepare intelligent creatures for other worlds in the course of preparation for the occupation of rational creatures. We only add to his idea of "a training school," that if we incorporate the Theocratic idea, and that such in view of their relationship to Jesus are fitted—being like Him and filled by His spirit—to impress an existing Theocratic ordering, or to inaugurate and carry on, through the Christ a Theocratic government, the force, beauty, and sublimity of the whole is advanced. This the above writer hints at in the expression, "and in all worlds, instructing and governing their more youthful and inexperienced inhabitants ;" we, however, bring it forth prominently. Numerous writers of great ability declare that the redeemed will visit other worlds, angelic like, to tell the wondrous story of redemption, exhibit in their own persons its results, show forth the praises of Father, Son, and Spirit, etc. To this we add : their powers will be exerted in enforcing the highest and noblest of all relations, *the Theocratic.*

Obs. 3. The questions of David (Ps. 8 : 3, 4) and Solomon (2 Chron. 6 : 18) are only satisfactorily answered on the supposition of the vast extent and inhabited (intelligent) condition of other worlds, and that the visiting and dwelling of God spoken of have reference to this Theocratical order, a relationship similar to that enjoyed by other worlds, but for which this world has made itself unworthy on account of sin. It is a matter of no surprise that God should manifest Himself thus nearly in government to unfallen beings, but it is a matter of the highest amazement that so great a God should be so merciful in condescending to fallen man, requiring, in order to affect a restoration, a costly sacrifice of love.

The reader will find some writers who, in order to meet the objections of infidelity respecting the insignificancy of the earth, contend that this world is the only one inhab-

ited by intelligent creatures, as e.g. the author of *The Plurality of Worlds* (with Introd. by Pres. Hitchcock). But this is virtually a lowering of the creative power, moral and civil government, etc., of God, and a darkening of the immensity of the universe over against the light thrown upon it in Scripture. We would rather take the views, as more biblical, reasonable, and worthy of God's greatness, of that class of writers illustrated by Sir David Brewster's work, *More Worlds than One the Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian.* (Comp. also an anon. work entitled *The Universe no Desert, the Earth no Monopoly*, Huygen's *Celestial Worlds Discovered*, Dick's *Ch. Philosophy*, Fontenelle's *Plurality of Worlds*, and the writings of Bruno, Galileo, Chalmers, and others.) We cannot receive Whewell's view, that this earth alone is inhabited, and outside of it there is a "universe of vast watery balls, each wrapped around a central cinder," etc. Some, however, add to this the idea that the earth becomes the centre of other worlds which eventually also become habitable. But such theories exalt our planet beyond all others in point of favor, when it is but small in comparison with what astronomy reveals. Proctor in "Other Worlds and Other Universes" (*Eclec. Mag.*, April, 1877) occupies a medium between the two views, making, in brief, different stages of preparation, inhabitation, desolation, renewal, occupying countless ages, so that some (not all, because others are represented in a stage of preparation, or else in a course of desolation) are inhabited. So also in "Life, past and future, in other Worlds" (*Science and Byways*) he asserts, as a culmination, that "every member of every order—planet, sun, galaxy, and so onward to higher and higher orders endlessly—has been, is now, or will hereafter be, life-supporting 'after its kind.'" Dr. Sprecher (*Groundwork of Theol.*, p. 367) takes the position that all other globes may be, like the earth once was, merely in a gradual preparatory state to receive ultimately rational creatures. Admitting that such may be the case with many, yet it seems to be opposed to analogy and Scripture intimations to conclude that this is the case with all, because (1) it would exalt our globe, but an atom compared with the universe, out of all proportion in the scale of creation ; (2) it would lessen our idea of the declarative glory of God, promoted by an intelligent creation ; (3) it would limit the creation of intelligent creatures, such like man, to a very brief period ; (4) the main reasons urged in favor of such an opinion, derived from the observation of a few planets (viz., that they are unfitted for men to live in, etc.) have no special force, because (*a*) others may be fitted and inhabited, while such are in a transitory or preparative stage, and (*b*) the conditions under which life may be sustained in other planets may vary considerably from ours, evidencing the variety in creation. The deductions of astronomy and of science do not invalidate the opinion of older writers, and in the language of a writer (*North Brit. Review*, May, 1854) the inhabitation of such worlds "assigns the cause of their existence," for to believe that all these ponderous bodies were created in order to give light, and "that the descendants of Adam might study their motion and write books of astronomy, is an opinion which could only find credence in minds of the most limited capacity, and in hearts devoid of all sympathy and feeling." While unable to form so harsh a judgment, yet it seems that a proper consideration of honor, power, glory belonging to God *as Creator*, should forbid our limiting the intelligences created to praise and adore Him as the Almighty. (*On Plurality of World's* comp. Lord's *Lit. and Theol. Journal*, Oct., 1854, *Proph. Times*, Nos. 9 and 10, 1874, etc.)

Obs. 4. This Kingdom—Theocratic-Davidic—is represented as bringing this world into direct communication and fellowship with the Universe. Owing to rebellion, the angelic hosts, which once shouted for joy at the exhibition of creative energy, withdrew from this world, and only occasionally have they been permitted to reveal themselves to man. But this interdiction, caused by sinfulness, will be withdrawn, for on the restoration of this Kingdom, under the blessed reign of Christ, they shall freely communicate with this earth as Jesus told Nathaniel (John 1 : 51). This also indicates that the government thus instituted, which restores such intercommunication, is in full accord with that in other parts of the Universe. And as many able writers have asserted as highly probable, there may be, the saints being made equal unto angels, and their transportation being dependent upon their will, communication by the saints with other worlds thus practically and effectively presenting in the persons of the redeemed the work of Redemption. Thus the redeemed may be employed to show

forth (Eph. 3 : 10) "the manifold wisdom of God," and "the unsearchable riches of Christ," answerable to the desire (1 Pet. 1 : 12) of even angels, and to the wide extent (Rev. 5 : 13) to which the knowledge of the Lamb and ascriptions of praise to Him shall progress.

In Prop. 179, Obs. 8, we guarded our doctrine against a perversion so far as the covenanted Theocratic Kingdom of David's Son is concerned, and the biblical statement on the subject. While the Bible is only concerned with the redemption of the world and largely excludes the universe, yet it finds, as we have shown, its attachment to the universe likewise in its ultimate outcome. This Theocratic idea thus urged also presents us with an argument against the deductions of unbelief drawn from the alleged smallness of the earth when contrasted with the greatness of the universe (as urged by White, Draper, and others, and which—Curtis's *Life of Webster*, vol. 2, p. 684—affected Webster's reason but could not remove his faith), because it shows us the unity of government existing, the intimate and enduring relationship of all worlds to the Almighty. It enhances the majesty of God, the extent and benevolence of His Divine Cognizance, the importance and value of religious and civil principles, the love and mercy shown to creatures.

Obs. 5. This union, however, with other worlds, is evidenced by the very constitution of the Theocracy itself as realized and exhibited in the person of the Theocratic King and His associated Rulers. If the King were merely David's Son then the Kingdom would be isolated and confined to humanity—*the precious Theocratic element* would be lacking. But with David's Son is inseparably connected the fulness of God, the invisible God (Col. 1 : 15–20, etc.), the Divine, so that *God* rules in and through this Son. The Divine-Human makes Him the specific Theocratic King by whom this world is brought into desirable and blessed subjection. The Divine—the same to which creative power and all the divine attributes are ascribed before its conjunction with David's Son—forms the link, in its union with humanity, by which the latter is brought into its true relationship with the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, attracting and binding it to the Divine in the firmest of bonds, and then through the Divine (for Father and Son are One) attracting and binding it to the general, universal system of law, order, blessedness, etc., under the Sovereignty of God Himself. Even, as intimated, this might be adduced from the associated Rulers, for they are represented as partaking of the divine both in soul and body—in soul specially baptized by the Spirit, thus imparting of the fulness given to Jesus, and in body made like unto Christ by the power of resurrection and glorification—so that this very impartation of the divine, by which they are elevated to an equality with angels, leads to the conclusion that the barrier hitherto existing between this world and others is broken down by the raising up of humanity *to the plane occupied by other intelligences*, the divine cementing and perpetuating the union thus effected. The comprehensiveness of the blessings pronounced on the saints go far to strengthen such a position, while the distinctive relationship they sustain to the King of kings fully confirms it.

The student may be interested to notice the work *The Unseen Universe; or Physica Speculations on a Future State*, in which a need for Christ is found in the general economy of the universe. This is based on the creative power attributed to the divine in Christ, making Him "the mysterious, infinitely energetic, intelligent, developing agency, residing in the universe and therefore being, in some sense, conditioned." While constituting the Father unconditioned, "the unconditioned First Cause of all things," the work also concludes the Son to be God "of the same substance as the Father, but different in person, and who has agreed to develop the will of the Father, and thus in some mysteri-

ous sense to submit to conditions and to enter the universe. The relation of this Being to the Father is expressed in Hebrews, in the words of the Psalmist: 'Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me; I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.'" "In fine, such a Being would represent that conditioned yet infinitely powerful developing agent, which the universe, objectively considered, appears to lead up to. His work is twofold; for in the first place He develops the various universes or orders of being, and secondly, in some mysterious way He becomes Himself the type or pattern of each order, the representative of Deity, as far as the beings of that order can comprehend, especially manifesting such divine qualities as could not otherwise be brought to light," etc. He thus "fills all things." Whatever force the student may allow to such representations, the work is vitiated (however it may incline to the divine aspect of the Son of God, etc.) by not discriminating between the Divine Sovereignty appertaining to Deity and the union of Deity and humanity in the Person of David's Son *for a specific purpose*, viz., to exhibit in and through Him a Theocratic rule here upon the earth. Hence the work does not observe that "the Christ" is not a title pertaining to the universe or to creation, but a title and office belonging to this earth, revealing God to us as *actual real earthly Theocratic Ruler* in the humanity of Jesus. We find too much resemblance to the utterances of the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria (comp. Kingsley's *Schools of Alexandria*, Neander's *Ch. History*, etc.), which diverges from the biblical statements in exalting the divine and ignoring the human: for as Augustine long ago stated, there is a wide difference between the two representations, in that the Platonist utterances simply affirm the divine nature of the Logos (Philo's "Divinity articulate"), while the Scriptures insist, as forming "the Christ" an incarnation, humiliation, suffering, death, resurrection, exaltation, return of the Son of Man, etc., relating to this earth. The objection, then, to such works is this: they swallow up the distinctive Christ and covenanted work in the divine.

PROPOSITION 196. *This doctrine of the Kingdom gives us a more comprehensive view of the work of Christ for Redemptive purposes.*

This is seen in the fact that our doctrine makes much of what Christ *is yet to do* at His Sec. Advent. Even many of our opponents concede what Dr. Gerhart (art. on Christianity and the Advent) asserts that Christianity is "only relatively complete" but advocating its completion at the Sec. Advent, saying: "In the Sec. Advent, accordingly, Christianity will become the absolutely complete divine revelation," i.e. realized. But our view embraces not merely the completion of salvation in the saints of this and former ages by experiencing the resurrection, etc., but includes salvation in restoration to *all forfeited* blessings pertaining to saints, to the Jewish nation and the race. The Kingdom itself, while embracing salvation, becomes *the medium* of salvation to the world. When this period of re-establishment comes, then to the preparatory work of Christ is *added* the direct supernatural Theocratic power by which deliverance is obtained and evermore sustained. Without detracting from the necessary and precious work already performed and now in progress, our view lays great stress on that which is *yet to follow* (founded on the sacrifice of Calvary), and unites the two in order to give the true and comprehensive sense under which it is to be regarded, thus making His Sec. Coming "*the blessed hope*" and a coming "*unto salvation*" in its widest reach.

Obs. 1. The careful student will have noticed that the Jews before and at the Advent of Jesus were accustomed to designate the period or results when the throne and Kingdom of David should be restored under the Messiah, as "*the Salvation.*" This phrase is strictly biblical, summing up in a word the *totality of blessing*, and was derived from the Millennial descriptions of the prophets, as e.g. Isa. 25 : 9. The Kingdom of the Messiah and salvation were in the Jewish mind convertible terms; and it needs no reflection to show how appropriate the term is, seeing that it was employed by the prophets to designate the deliverance from all evil and the bestowment of all blessings *in this Kingdom.* The term "salvation," correctly apprehended by the primitive Church, was from Origen's time applied too much to the present life and to the intermediate state. If we turn to the apostolic teaching we find, on the other hand, a full and free *adoption* of the Jewish phraseology, without placing upon it another and widely differing interpretation, and its direct reference to the future, when, as prophets teach, it will be realized. Thus e.g. Heb. 9 : 28;

2 Tim. 2 : 10 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 9 ; Rom. 13 : 11, and kindred passages take for granted that the salvation spoken of is *the same* that pious Jews expected. If otherwise it would have been differently explained, and the first churches would have been enlightened concerning it. The expectation of salvation related to the fulfilment of the covenant and restoration of the nation is well stated by Zacharias (Luke 1 : 69–75) as embraced by the holy prophets, and *this salvation* the apostles declared—whatever the earnest might be in the present or intermediate—*to be still future.*

It is saddening to see the modern conceptions of "salvation," and to observe how intelligent men, in order to exalt them, decry the ancient views—although sustained by the plain grammatical sense—as "carnal." What a contrast exists between the present prevailing spiritualistic, indefinite belief and the one based on the oath-bound covenants! If we even venture to call attention to this antagonism, and to question the modern faith, multitudes are ready to designate our course as "heretical," if not something worse. Alas! what an astonishing change, when "the Christ," "the Kingdom," and even "salvation" itself are transformed from their *covenanted and predicted meaning.* The most selfish and mystical conceptions are adopted in preference to the simple truth.

Obs. 2. Hence the Gospel is denominated "*the word of salvation.*" Acts 13 : 26, which is to be realized through Christ—the reception of, and obedience to, Jesus is "*the way of salvation,*" Acts 16 : 17—the reception of the truth in Christ imparting remission of sin is "*the knowledge of salvation,*" Luke 1 : 77—the Gospel of Christ is "*the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,*" Rom. 1 : 16. Such references, implying the distinctive salvation as future, could be easily multiplied. The reader will notice, as e.g. in Eph. 1 : 13, 14 ; Phil. 1 : 27–29, that, whatever we now receive from "the Gospel of salvation," it is only "*the earnest*" of the distinguishing salvation—the specific salvation—held forth by the covenant and promises. The least reflection will indicate *the propriety* of this feature and of the careful language of the apostles when referring to it. For certainly in this life, subject still to trial, suffering, death, etc., the saint is not delivered, and surely in the intermediate state, whatever it may be, with the body in the grave, the non-fulfilment of covenant promises, the postponement of the reign on earth, etc., the saint is not enjoying the predicted inheritance, crown, reward, etc., only to be given at the Sec. Advent. Therefore it is that the apostles so constantly contrast the present condition of saints with that which will be experienced at the Coming of Christ, as e.g. 1 John 3 : 2 ; Rom. 8 : 24 ; Rom. 5 : 1, 2 ; 1 John 2 : 28 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 5, 7, 13 ; 4 : 13 ; 5 : 1, 4, 10 ; James 1 : 12 ; 2 : 5 ; 5 : 7–9 ; 2 Thess. 1 : 5–11, etc. Indeed, it is in view of this *inexpressibly great salvation still future,* that Paul makes the much-admired argument in 1 Cor. 15, where he says, "*If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable,*" showing that by the resurrection of Jesus we have a firm, sure hope of being also finally saved through Him by the power of the resurrection in the order and manner delineated in the chapter. Therefore it follows, as a matter of course, that believers, even receiving "the token" and "the earnest" of salvation should be exhorted to "*work out* their own salvation," Phil. 2 : 12—to put on "for a helmet *the hope* of salvation" that they may "*obtain* salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Thess. 5 : 8, 9 (and which is linked by the context with "the day of the Lord")—to "stand fast" that they may make manifest that they are indeed "chosen and called *unto* salvation

through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," 2 Thess. 2 : 13, 15—to " endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also *obtain* the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory," 2 Tim. 2 : 10–12 to hold to the Holy Scriptures which are able to make us wise *unto* salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ, 2 Tim. 3 : 15—to take heed unto themselves and unto the doctrine, continuing in the same, that they *may be* saved, 1 Tim. 4 : 16 ; etc.—so that those who are added to the Church are " such as *should be* saved," Acts 2 : 47—that those who are sharply dealt with *may* " *be* saved in the day of the Lord Jesus," 1 Cor. 5 : 5 — that those for whom we patiently labor " *may be* saved," 1 Cor. 10 : 33 and 15 : 2 — that salvation through the truth is freely tendered to all men, 1 Tim. 2 : 4 ; Acts 15 : 11 ; Rom. 5 : 9, 10, etc., in order that they may become Heb. 1 : 14, " *heirs of salvation.*" The great, *the emphatic salvation* is then still future, and hence, *the work of Christ*, is not yet completed. The solid foundation is indeed laid, the preparatory work is progressing, but *the time* for the *perfect realization* of salvation has not yet arrived.

This most effectually sets aside those extravagant eulogies of the present and of the intermediate state, so loudly proclaimed by numerous writers. Whatever these may bestow upon us, they are only the earnests of the great salvation, and it is a disparagement of the Sec. Advent and its results to disconnect and transpose that which the Spirit has joined together. To elevate the preparatory to completion, to exalt the initiatory to consummation, to substitute human hopes and expectations for the express promises of the Scriptures is *unwise and derogatory* to the Word. Salvation includes far more than moral and bodily regeneration, for it embraces the covenanted Kingdom of God, the inheritance of David's Son, the joint-heirship and reign with the Christ, the restoration of the Jewish nation and its Theocratic exaltation, the willing subjection of the nations, the renewal of creation, the blessings, honor, and glory of the ages to come. This is a salvation indeed, far-reaching and wide-sweeping, commensurate with the necessities and happiness of the individual, the elect nation, the Gentile nations, the race and the world.

Obs. 3. The apostles not only freely adopt the current phraseology of the Jews concerning salvation—thus indorsing them—but in the most positive manner point out that the expected salvation to which the tribes hope to come is *delayed* to the Sec. Advent. Let the reader place himself in the position of Jewish expectation based on the prophets—let him entertain the Messianic ideas of the Kingdom, viz., the Messiah sitting on the restored Davidic throne and Kingdom reigning over the earth and which was expressively summed up in the prophetically derived word, " *Salvation*"—and with such views let him read the utterances of the apostles respecting salvation, and he will be—as the early churches were—*confirmed* in his Jewish ideas. Thus e.g. to illustrate—take Paul's instructions to Titus (ch. 2 : 11–13), and the salvation that the grace of God brings, instead of being manifested " in this present world " (in which we are to " live soberly, righteously, and godly,") is postponed to " *the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*" so that now we are exhorted to be " *looking for that blessed hope*" inspired by the prophets. In Heb. 2 : 3–5, the "*great salvation*" is linked with " *the world to come,*" the Jewish aspect of which has already been sufficiently indicated under Prop. 137. Jude, verse 3, writes of a " common salvation," but unites this in his short epistle with the Coming of the Lord and of His saints (v. 14), and with the presence of His glory (vs. 21 and 24). But Peter (1 Pet. 1 : 3–13) declaring, that those who are saved " *are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last*

time," and after asserting that this salvation still future is identical with that prophesied by the prophets, in the most positive manner (vs. 7 and 13) teaches that it will only be realized "*at the appearing of Jesus Christ,*" and "*at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" Surely this ought to be *decisive* of the matter.

Surely such plain and emphatic Scripture as has been thus presented ought to sweep out of existence that abundance of religious literature—so darkening to the truth and so deadly to a proper appreciation of "the blessed hope"—which makes "the salvation" so complete in this life and after death that it practically reduces such passages to no special value and preciousness. To make the earnest equivalent to the glory, and to elevate death into the place of "the Christ" coming unto salvation, renders its believer *incapable* of a correct apprehension of the Divine Purpose in "salvation," or to appreciate even what the Scriptures mean by "salvation."

Obs. 4. Seeing that the apostles refer the salvation spoken of by the prophets to *the time* of the Sec. Advent, it may be corroborative of our position to glance at some of the prophecies which describe it, and notice, briefly, what things are included under the phrase. If we take Isa. 25 : 9 we find by the context that it embraces the reign of the Messiah in Jerusalem, the resurrection of the righteous, the overthrow of all enemies, universal dominion, etc. The salvation of Ps. 9 : 14 is identified with "the lifting up from the gates of death," the removal of enemies, the judging of the world in righteousness, etc. The salvation of the righteous in Ps. 37 : 39 is linked with the inheriting of the earth when the wicked are utterly rooted out of it. When "the Lord makes known His salvation" Ps. 98 : 2 it is, when He comes "to judge the earth," when He has done "marvellous things," and "His right hand and His holy arm hath gotten Him the victory," and "He hath remembered His mercy and His truth toward the house of Israel." When "the Lord becomes our salvation" Ps. 118 : 14, He overthrows the confederation of nations that compass the righteous, He remembers mercy for the elect nation and doeth valiantly ; the righteous "shall not die but live," for He will not give them "over unto death." When God will "clothe the Priests with salvation" Ps. 132 : 16, it is said that David's Son shall sit upon David's throne, "for the Lord hath chosen Zion, He hath desired it for His habitation. This is my rest forever ; here will I dwell, for I have desired it"—"there will I make the horn of David to bud" and "His enemies will I clothe with shame, but upon Himself shall His crown flourish," etc. At the time the Lord "will beautify (comp. 2 Thess. 1 : 10) the meek with salvation" Ps. 149 : 4, then Israel will rejoice in their King, the saints will be joyful in glory, and the honor of executing judgment is conferred upon them. Thus the Psalmist portrays salvation, and it is worthy of remark that the personal presence of the Messiah (comp. marg. reading of Ps. 42 : 5) is *requisite* (see Prop. 120 and 121) to secure it, and that it necessarily embraces a restoration from dispersion and captivity (comp. Ps. 85 : 9 ; Ps. 14 : 7 ; Ps. 53 : 6). One of the most mournful and pathetic representations of the downfall of the nation, the desolations of Zion, the treading down of God's own inheritance, is found in Ps. 74, and here the inspired writer, recognizing the election and the consequent Theocratic union which (interrupted as it may be for a while) can never be entirely removed, asks God "*how long*" this shall continue, and rests himself upon the Theocratic idea "for God is my King of old, working salvation in the

midst of the earth," believing that He will "*have respect unto the covenant.*" If there is force in language, the certain inference follows of *a complete restoration of Theocratic rule* over the nation with which it is specially identified. Turn to Isaiah, and the same strain is continued. When "God is our salvation" and we shall "draw with joy water out of the wells of salvation" Isa. 12 : 2. 3, it is, as the context shows, *when* He arises to smite the earth, to slay the wicked, to reign gloriously, to recover the remnant of His people "the outcasts of Israel and the dispersed of Judah, and *when* "the Holy One of Israel" is present. Comp. Isa. 33 : 16–22 ; 45 : 17 context ; 49 : 8–11 ; 59 : 16–21 ; 60 : 1–22 ; 63 : 5 ; 61 : 10 ; 62 : 1, etc. Such references could be multiplied, the prophets being filled with them, in which this salvation *is connected* with the Coming of the Lord, the resurrection of saints, the entire removal of enemies, the return of the Jewish nation, and the restoration of the Davidic-Theocratic order under the Messiah, the universal dominion and blessedness resulting out of this arrangement, the removal of the curse, and the regaining of Edenic conditions, the bestowment of additional honor, power, glory. Taking even such a brief survey of the prophets, seeing how the apostles united their fulfilment with the future Advent of King Jesus, surely the early Church was *consistent and logical* when it thus received and understood "salvation," and *looked for Jesus to come and finish the work so happily begun.*

How is it possible, then, with such a connected series of things pertaining to the one salvation, that men so persistently close their eyes to the same, and believe in and represent to us a salvation materially different from this portrayal? Is there not a heavy weight of responsibility somewhere? Take up our respective systems of divinity, and, with scarcely an exception, they teach a salvation which the primitive believers could not possibly recognize as the scriptural salvation *covenanted and predicted.* Many of those systems are satisfied with securing in some (an imperfect) way the happiness and blessedness of the individual, and if they can land him safely in the third heaven, they deem their work complete. If such succeed in spiritualizing the inheritance of Jesus and of His saints, and in having the humanity completely absorbed in the divine, they consider their task fully accomplished, no matter how antagonistic it may be to the express language of Scripture and to the faith of pious Jews and early believers.

Obs. 5. An essential part of the work of Christ, is to fulfil the covenants and the prophets. This He has done to a certain extent, and is now performing in the Church and world, but *the most remarkable and desirable portion* is still unfulfilled. The sealing of the covenant with His own precious blood, etc., is exceedingly precious, but the fulfilment of the covenant in actual realization is described *as blessed beyond description.* Indeed, if we but stop to reflect, that the prophets scarcely dwell upon the intermediate, intercallary state but hasten on to describe, under every variety of expressive language, the astounding work that the Lord shall perform in the day when the Covenanted Kingdom and its attendant blessings shall be experienced, *then* we have evidence, afforded by the Spirit, how much of the utmost value is still related to the future.

The prophets give place to a very small space in describing the humiliation, sufferings, and death of the Messiah, when compared with the larger one appropriated in portraying the realization of salvation under His Theocratic rule. The former, indispensable, was a sad, mournful subject, the latter a triumphant one ; the former, exceedingly precious, was a means to secure a glorious end, the latter a description of the splendid results attained by it. We would not for worlds detract from the glory of the cross, but

while surveying it with love and reverence, it would be weakness and lack of wisdom if we did not look with hope and joy at *the sublime end* which it is intended to subserve. We are too apt by confining ourselves to the sacrifice on the cross, to limit the range of Scripture passages. The intent and scope that the Spirit had in view, is marred by our not constantly keeping in view the entire Divine Plan which the blessed sacrifice so vitally subserves. Thus e.g. John 1 : 29 ; Gal. 1 : 4, etc. receive deeper significancy when we contemplate redemption perfected, and then consider by whom it is perfected, and by what a costly and necessary sacrifice its ultimate completion and realization are secured. The full meaning of Jesus being the propitiation of our sins and of the world, will be only seen and appreciated when covenants and prophecy are amply fulfilled.

Obs. 6. The work of Jesus is also that of restoring the Kingdom of God, as instanced, e.g. Acts 15 : 16. We have seen how this was evidenced even by the first preaching of this Kingdom. The Kingdom was overthrown ; it was offered on condition of repentance ; it was rejected and then postponed. Will it ever thus remain postponed ? No ! the entire spirit of the Old and New Test. points to the future manifestation of Jesus Christ as the Theocratic King, when this glorious work of restitution will be performed. The titles of Messiah, Christ, Lord, and King, whatever applicability they may have to the present, have reference to this specific appointed work of rebuilding the fallen tabernacle of David and reigning over it, bringing all nations, through it, in willing subjection to His world-wide dominion. Even the names of Jesus, Saviour, and Redeemer assume a deeper significancy, when the power of the first resurrection, the bestowment of Kingship and priesthood, the actual inheriting of the Kingdom and its attendant blessings, are experienced. Let the Kingdom be re established as predicted with Jesus Christ at its head, dispensing the grace of His reign, and the world has practically evidenced the sublime truth that it is through Christ *alone* that the world is saved. He and He alone is the procuring cause and most efficient instrumentality in doing this by the establishment of a Kingdom *in every way* adapted to the necessities, welfare and happiness of man.

Our entire work has this for its definite purpose, viz., to show how and when the covenanted Theocracy of the Messiah is to be established by Him at His return. This is *the grand goal* of both covenant and prophecy, and by it the honor and glory of God is fully and perfectly manifested ; by it the redemption of the creature and world is completely secured.

Obs. 7. The work of Jesus, which is to "*destroy the works of the devil*" (1 John 3 : 8), is only partially performed. The requisite preliminaries have been graciously provided in His own sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension, and exaltation—the gathering out of an elect people is going on, and the earnest of Redemption is thus mercifully presented—salvation is freely tendered to all who will comply with the conditions of repentance and faith—but *the great culminating work*, which results in the complete overthrow of Satan, and the restoration of all the blessings forfeited through him, is *postponed—mercifully* also, seeing that by it a chosen body of first-fruits is secured—until the time of the revelation of this Kingdom. Redemption is still incomplete ; the works of Satan still exist ; and he is the god of this world ; the saints even fall under the power of the enemy death and are not delivered from the grave ; sin and its sad results are visible on all sides in the continued curse fallen upon creation. Modern theology has too much confined the work of Christ in the destroying the

works of the devil *to this dispensation* or intermediate period, and overlooking, or, underrating what Christ *is yet to do* (directly and by supernatural power, which alone can reach those works), in order to accomplish this work. Indeed, so far has this advanced under spiritualistic and mystical influences, that multitudes have such exalted views of the Redemption of the saints in present deliverance from the works and power of Satan and present resultant happiness in Christ, that nothing further seems necessary to secure its perfection, so that even the resurrection, the Edenic state, the removal of the curse from creation, and other grave points involved, are either discarded, or ignored or slightly esteemed as of no real importance to the perfect accomplishment of the work. On the other hand, relying on *perfect* Redemption through a *perfect* Redeemer, our doctrine carefully notices, what are the works and results of sin, and presents, in strict accord with the Divine Word, *an ample and complete removal* of all of them, and a restoration to the position occupied by the race before the fall—the grand work which Jesus is yet to perform.

Hence through the sacrifice and power of our Coming Saviour we hold to the highest redemption of Israel from the grave, and from all enemies, the entire sanctification of His people and devotedness to His service, restoration to all forfeited blessings, and increased blessedness resulting from ample deliverance from evil and the bestowal of eternal good.

Obs. 8. The sacrifice made by Christ on the cross, is more fully and effectively presented in this Kingdom. Instead of confining its efficacy to the present dispensation and making it, after this age ends, *something of the past*, its efficiency and power is constantly and ever more exerted. For, aside from its moral influence in the world to come, aside from its being the source of inestimable blessings, forgiveness, exaltation, etc., to the saints, it continues to wield, through faith, its saving power over the nations in the flesh. The simple fact that such a King died for sin, that the acceptance and honored acknowledgment of the sacrifice by the Father is made apparent in Christ's visible reign and in that of the splendidly arrayed associated Rulers (who were purified and saved by His blood), will so magnify God's law, portray the vileness of sin, afford assurance of pardon and mercy, confirm the condemnation of wickedness, exalt the love of God toward man in and through His Son, that *the time* has at length come when *all* shall feel the importance, necessity, and nobleness of living faith in this sacrifice. The benefits flowing from it are now *visibly presented*, and become more practically extended, until the world itself is embraced in their enjoyment. Following the Word step by step, it will be found that the sacrifice forms *an eternal basis* for the Kingdom itself. For it constitutes the Theocratic King a Saviour who now saves from sin without violation or lessening of law, He having died "the just for the unjust," and even qualifies Him as such a King, so that in virtue of His obedience unto death He is given authority over all enemies, and to restore all things. It ennobles His royalty, and binds His associated Rulers and subjects to a loving recognition of His amazing love and worthiness to receive all honor and praise. It purchased this inheritance, the glorification and rulership of the saints, and *so long* as inheritance, glorification and rulership lasts, will *the procuring cause* be esteemed and lauded. This sacrifice affects the restoration of the Jewish nation; for when the happy time comes that they shall look upon Him whom they have pierced, faith in that sacrifice shall

also in them bring forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness. The allegiance of the nations, and all the Millennial and New Jerusalem descriptions are realized as *resultants* flowing from this sacrifice being duly appreciated and gratefully, yea joyfully, acknowledged. It is ever *the inexhaustible fountain* from whence the abundant mercies of God flow to a world redeemed by it. For then the world is truly in the highest sense, reconciled to God through Christ, and forgiveness of, and restoration from sin, is illustrated and enforced in the wonderful deliverance vouchsafed, and in the unmerited blessings bestowed, while the glorious truth that Christ died for the good of man, the race, and the world is openly manifested in the abundant good received and evermore experienced. The work of Christ in all its fulness, even that relating to the sacrifice already made, cannot be properly estimated unless we notice *the end* that God purposes in this Theocratic Kingdom. Without the Sacrifice and the additional work, it could not possibly exist, either in the person of its immortal King, or in its immortal Rulers, or in its repentant and believing Jewish nation, or in the worshipping and obedient nations of the earth. Sin, as evinced in its past power and melancholy results, would be a barrier to its erection. Human depravity is incapable of erecting such a Kingdom, and as history sadly attests, is incapable of sustaining it when erected. Hence before its re-establishment, a sure foundation must be laid against sin ; and this is done in the sacrifice made for sin, in the gathering out of those who avail themselves of it and are therefore accounted worthy to enter into and inherit or participate in the Kingdom, as well as in the executive, legislative, and judicial power, that will be exerted by this King when the period arrives for the Kingdom to be revealed. It will not, cannot be exhibited, until it comes with *a mighty preponderating, overwhelming, irresistible manifested righteousness* which easily crushes all opposition, and insures stability and perpetuity. The Kingdom itself is *the culminated fruit of the sacrifice* (and in the sense that without the latter the former could not exist), but receives for its accomplishment additional aid, in the Omnipotence then exerted in its behalf by the Mighty God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Yes ! let us, in imagination, take our position in the established Theocratic Kingdom, and we can easily realize the simple fact that the Theocratic King—so exalted and majestic, so mighty and the Purchaser of salvation—having died to secure redemption, will ever preserve the loyalty and love of His subjects. Saints experiencing the blessings of perfected salvation are, of course, self-devoted to the Theocracy ; Jews, repentant and believing, restored and exultant with their station after painful ages of affliction, are jubilant in their adhesion to a Messiah once scorned and rejected ; and Gentiles, coming under and realizing the blessings of the Theocratic sway, cheerfully honor and praise the King. Imagine ourselves in such a happy state, and in it to read Rom. 5 : 10 ; 2 Cor. 5 : 19 ; Eph. 2 : 16, and a thousand similar passages, and will not our hearts be so bound up with this King and the welfare of His Kingdom that to serve and honor Him will be *our highest joy ?* Well can we see how the future mission of the Church (Eph. 3 : 21) and of the Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 11) will be verified by glorious experience.

Obs. 9. The continuance of the saving work of Christ in the age to come, is confirmed by the eternal priesthood of Christ.

This is set forth under Prop. 155 and others, so that it requires no special mention. If the reader will turn e.g. to Props. 200 and 204, he will find that the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, the Self-manifestation of the Father in the Son, the Humanity derived from David united with Deity, is yet to exhibit itself in behalf of humanity on a scale made possible by the consummation of the preparatory measures, viz., in a direct, pure

Theocratic reign and priesthood, through which the world, so longsuffering and in misery, will experience "the refreshing and restitution."

Obs. 10. There is a part of the work of Christ exclusively confined to the elect, first-born saints who inherit the Kingdom, which so far exceeds all our powers, that it can only be stated, leaving the future, by blessed experience, to determine its nature and glory. "*Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*," i.e. one who is accounted worthy of being a King and Priest in this Kingdom must be such in a different form from the present. To be qualified for rulership he must not only be holy, etc., in reference to soul but must have an immortal, indestructible, mighty, heavenly body as Paul describes in 1 Cor. 15. Hence it is distinctly stated that saints shall be made (1 John 3 : 2) like unto Christ, and Phil. 3 : 21, Christ at His appearing "shall change this vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body," etc. The body itself undergoes a transformation, resulting in glorification. Just as Christ assumed human nature to bring Himself in covenanted relationship to man, and to obtain the covenanted Theocratic order as David's Son and Lord, and, by virtue of the sacrifice offered by Himself, took upon Himself human nature in its glorified form to be qualified for His reign, so we, if united with Christ in salvation and the higher Theocratic relationship, must, by His aid, take upon ourselves *the same transformed nature* to receive the proper qualifications. This future identity with Christ and actual assumption of His (i.e. like unto His) transformed human nature, is in some theologies too much *abstracted* from the glorified state (still future), and applied to the present age or intermediate state. Scripture, however, specifically locates its *reception* at the Sec. Advent. As there are things connected with Christ in His person and aims, in His divinity and glorified humanity, which transcend the grasp of our present knowledge, so in virtue of this union with Christ and the consequent transformation into His likeness, there are things which, owing to our limited understanding, we see but imperfectly, and others which are now beyond our comprehension.

Obs. 11. The benefits resulting from the work of Christ are both spiritual and temporal ; refer to soul, body, race, and earth. It is painful to take up some Systems of Divinity (as e.g., even the more moderate one of Knapp, Sec. 118), and mystical works (Schoolmen and others), and find it directly asserted that through Christ, and obedience to Him, we only are to receive "spiritual blessings" and *no* "*earthly good* "—blessings relating to the soul and not to the body, etc., and that hence "the Jewish idea of the Coming of a Millennial Kingdom of Christ upon earth *is entirely objectionable.*" Now aside from the self-contradiction in which some of these writers involve themselves when referring to the Divine Providence, the resurrection of the body, the removal of the curse, the restoration of the earth to an Edenic state, the future dominion over the earth, etc. (which necessarily embrace great blessings superadded to those conferred on the soul), it is astonishing that they cannot see that Redemption itself would be *imperfect without the direct conference* of earthly good and blessing. Indeed more than this, the very nature of the Kingdom includes a bountiful and continuous supply of *temporal* good for the restored Jewish nation and spared Gentiles. Prophecy is full of delineations on this point in the removal of sickness and of bodily infirmity, in the bestowal of fruit-

fulness and of increase, etc. The Kingdom of Christ, with all its extraordinary spiritual manifestations, is over nations living in the flesh, and in an earth dispensing the favors of bountiful seasons. As David's Son, His own inheritance is a material land and a material nation (Prop. 122), from which shall issue forth the choicest blessedness over all the material earth. This objection has already been noticed (Prop. 146, etc.), and attributed to the revived Gnostic idea of the innate sinfulness of matter (at least it assumes or takes for granted some such notion), which the Bible repudiates in the person of Jesus, in the original creation, and in the recreation. To confine Redemption exclusively to one aspect, either spiritual or temporal, is to make it one-sided and imperfect ; *both* must be included to give a perfect representation.

Obs. 12. While advocating, what the Bible clearly teaches, a work of Christ still future, which is added to what has already been done in order *to perfect* salvation and extend it over the earth, we must not be understood (as already intimated in the Prop. on sacrifices) as including in that future work any *additional* atoning work. Hence, we cannot receive the recent theory of Waggoner and others (inculcated in tracts and books), viz., that Christ is yet to perform an atoning work in the cleansing of the sanctuary in heaven by His blood, blotting out the sins borne into it and there standing recorded, and placing them on the head of the scapegoat (explained by them to be Satan). This theory is objectionable for various reasons. (1) It is based on the phrase " then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," and concludes from the word " sanctuary" that it denotes the sanctuary in heaven. But we find the land of Israel called " the sanctuary" in Ex. 15 : 17 ; Ps. 78 : 54 ; and at the very time intimated by Daniel, viz., when the Antichristian power is terribly overthrown (at the end of these days), we find by reference to Ezek. 39 : 12–15, when this power is vanquished, a cleansing of the land or sanctuary. This in itself would be sufficient to explain Daniel's statement without referring it, unless specific proof can be given, to another sanctuary. (2) It assumes an entire new covenant to begin with Christ's death, which is shown to be erroneous under Prop. 50. (3) It makes the atonement of Christ defective in so far that sins that are forgiven (as e.g. Christ forgave on earth), are still retained in record against the individual and are brought up in judgment against him in the future, thus constituting a sort of salvation through works. For this view certainly makes the salvation of the saint dependent on his own personal righteousness, while we regard the latter (i.e. works) as a necessary resultant of the obtaining of the righteousness of Christ, which being of grace and in the line of simple duty, merits no salvation (see Prop. 135). Then too, the sins of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the host of believers, are still uncancelled, and of course, if in this state, unforgiven. It thus introduces an unnecessary and injurious antagonism. (4) It separates the atonement and the remission of sins which were joined the one to the other in the typical observances (Lev. 16) by a long interval in the priestly office of Christ. This is opposed by the entire spirit of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which it is positively asserted that Christ not only made atonement once for all (Heb. 10 . 12 ; 8 : 27 ; 11 : 25, etc.), for sin, but that through that atonement already made, present remission of sin can be obtained (Heb. 9 : 13, 14, 15 ; 10 : 10–14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, etc.), and that through that blood we may be led to resist sin (Heb. 13 : 20–21, etc.). Indeed, present

remission is declared in the warning (Heb. 10 : 26,) that if we sin wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." The one then is not separated from the other by a long interval of time. (5) The cleansing of the sanctuary is not performed, as alleged, by the withdrawal of the sins from the sanctuary and placing them on the head of the scapegoat. For, according to Waggoner, the heavenly sanctuary has remained for centuries and still remains uncleansed. But in referring to the typical observances and then to Heb. 9 : 23, we find, that the purification is made by *the atoning blood*, so that God can be gracious and forgive sin, retaining the Divine purity of law and essential holiness of Himself. "The heavenly things" are already purified by the sacrifice made—and this is denominated expressively "reconciling the holy place," which reconciliation *is made manifest by the continued exaltation of Jesus* at the right hand of the Majesty on High. Admitting that the scapegoat or Azazel (as many believe) is typical of Satan—upon whom sin rests and shall rest at the consummation—it is sufficient to say, that this act connected with him has nothing to do with the purifying of the sanctuary since it is expressly declared that it was done after (Lev. 16 : 20), "*an end*" was made "*of reconciling the holy place.*" All that relates to the heavenly sanctuary in the way of affecting reconciliation, making God propitious has been already done by Jesus. (6) Rev. 11 : 19 and 10 : 7 affirm (as supposed) nothing respecting the cleansing of the sanctuary. (7) The judgment of Dan. 7 : 9–14 which is made to synchronize with and denote this cleansing is not a judgment *in the third heaven* but here *on the earth.* The assertion that the Ancient of Days does not *leave* heaven for earth, is refuted by the carefully overlooked phrase of verse 22 "*until the Ancient of Days came*" to the theatre where this war with the saints is progressing. (8) "Investigative judgment" as it is called by them, viz., the scrutiny of individual character, whatever it may be, whether progressive, continuous, or for a definite period, in order to apportion the rewards and stations, certainly does not refer to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary for in that case they have heaven cleansed just previous to the Sec. Advent, when really it is not cleansed *in the sense they advocate* by the admission that the wicked are only thus judged long after, viz., at the close of the one thousand years. The record of man's sins are kept, according to their views, in the same place, and hence that of the wicked. (9) The blotting out of sins upon which so much stress is laid, is derived from Acts 3 : 19, but that it does not refer to the place and manner indicated by them is evident from the way in which it is used in the Old Test. in Ps. 51 : 1, 9 ; Isa. 43 : 25 ; Jer. 18 : 23 ; Isa. 44 : 22 ; Neh. 4 : 5, where it denotes, (1) the present forgiveness of sin, and (2) the forgiveness of the Jewish nation at the time of its restoration. The entire removal of sin, of which an "earnest" is given, may, and indeed does, include the destruction of the sad results of sin, but the latter is affected only at the Sec. Advent and not previously. (10) And finally, the fallacy of the theory is made apparent by giving one extract from a tract (entitled "The Sanctuary of the Bible" by J. N. A.) : "the sins of the overcomers being blotted out, and the sanctuary (above) cleansed, the Son of God *is no longer needed as a great High Priest.* He therefore *ceases* from the office *forever* and becomes a King," etc. Any view that, over against the expressly announced unchangeable, ever-enduring Priesthood of Jesus, takes *the liberty* of ending the same, is most certainly deeply defective and unworthy of reception, however it may be sincerely held by good men. Prop. 155.

PROPOSITION 197. *This Kingdom, although visible with a world dominion, is also necessarily spiritual.*

This Proposition is the more needed since we are charged with gross carnality, etc., because we insist upon retaining the plain grammatical meaning assigned to the Kingdom in the Holy Scriptures. While a purely material, naturalistic Kingdom, without spirituality, is unscriptural, so likewise an entire spiritual Kingdom, without the sanctified union of the material or natural, is utterly opposed to the Word of God.

Under various Props. we have insisted upon the union of the visibility and spirituality of the Kingdom, as e.g. Prop. 58, Obs. 7 ; Props. 67 and 68 ; Prop. 156, Obs. 23 ; Prop. 155, Obs. 11 ; Prop. 171, etc. The visibility and outward nature of the Kingdom is seen under Props. 48, 49, 68, 122, 131, etc., and this is the specific covenanted Messianic Kingdom. We know of no other having a solid scriptural foundation. Hence we are pained at numerous statements made by writers who evidently totally misapprehend the Kingdom established by the Messiah. To illustrate : an excellent writer in many respects concludes an article (*Proph. Times*, 1870, pp. 145–150) : "But should the Church, or any portion of the Church, assume an inheritance in that which pertains to the Jew, she becomes herself an Antichrist and a deceiver," This is only true of the present time, but when the covenanted Kingdom is inherited at the Sec. Advent it is incorrect ; for the Jewish inheritance of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Jesus, the Apostles, etc., is also our inheritance—being the fallen tabernacle of David restored in Messianic grandeur and world-embracing. The foundation is Jewish and pertains to the Jew (comp. e.g. Props. 68, 46-52).

Obs. 1. Any reader that has followed the scriptural line of argument can see for himself that we are logically and irresistibly driven to the conclusion that the future Messianic Kingdom is a visible, external, world-dominion. The covenants and prophecy declare this emphatically, and *the very nature* of a restored Theocracy demands it. What Kingdom is it that was once existing, then withdrawn, and shall again, under the Messiah, be restored ? The *same Kingdom* in which God ruled on earth as an earthly king is to be reinstated. To this all the prophets with one voice testify, and this is the one postponed to the Second Advent. Now any other kingdom, not having a visible, world dominion, not having Theocratic rulers, organization, subjects and territory, could be the one thus held up to our faith and hope. A Kingdom, not Theocratic, not one in which God Himself rules, cannot possibly fill the divine portraiture ; and so, on the other hand, a Kingdom, without its material aspects, without its subjects and territory, can possibly correspond with the covenants and predictions on the subject.

A Kingdom e.g. such as Reuss (*His Ch. Theol. of Apos. Age*), or Shenkel (*Chris. Dog.*), and others, advocate, so spiritual that it has not distinctively a single marked feature characteristic of *the covenanted Theocracy* that is to be restored, must be dismissed as a Kingdom of human derivation. Has the same Kingdom once existing, then removed for

many centuries, been reinstated with additional (as promised) glory and power? If this is asserted, then we ask for the proof, which cannot be given. A substitution, a complete transformation, a spiritualizing only increases the difficulties of such teachers. We add: the very nature of a Theocracy, God Himself ruling as an earthly Ruler, evidences the spirituality co-existing.

Obs. 2. Because we contend that the fallen down tabernacle of David is to be restored with increased splendor and glory by David's Son, "the Son of Man," at His return, as the Scriptures abundantly declare, it is asserted by those who do not fathom the depth of the Theocratic idea also pertaining to it that our view is materialistic, carnal, fleshly, etc. The charge of "carnality" is sufficiently met in Prop. 203 (to which the reader will please turn and connect), but this lurking Gnostic conceit that matter must be evil, when even thus associated, is amply met if the opposer will only consider how this reflects upon the person of the Son of Man Himself. When in humanity, humiliated, suffering and dying was He carnal? or did the union and association of the material forbid the highest spirituality? Is it not true that humanity itself was adorned and sanctified by such a relationship, without preventing the purest, noblest, and highest of spiritual conceptions, actions, and living to be manifested? In the humanity of Jesus we have the embodiment of sinlessness and of truth. So, in the consideration of this restoration, it must ever be borne in mind that this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom will, in virtue of the Ruler at its head and its purified, exalted condition, be *the embodiment of purity and holiness.* It is "the fallen down tabernacle of David," not with its imperfections and weaknesses, not with its past sinfulness and errors of conduct, but restored in a purified, strengthened, perfected condition to adapt it to the honor and glory of its Ruler, and to its becoming an instrument of power and blessing to the world.

We simply point to the fact that the early believers accepted of this restored Theocracy as their hope and joy, and associated with it *the purest and highest* spiritual blessings and enjoyments. Thus, they united with it resurrection, translation, glorification, overcoming of enemies, blessed reign on the earth, joyful worship, unspeakable honor and exaltation with the Christ. They incorporated with it the presence of the King, the heavenly city, fulness of knowledge, perfection of holiness, ever-abiding love, blissful communion, etc. The most exalted spiritual excellences are combined with the temporal aspects of the Kingdom in its relation to the nations and the earth itself. Take the old Fathers and of them it can be said that, like Tertullian (Neander's *Antignosticus*, p. 484, Bohn's Ed.), although "a zealous advocate of Chiliasm, was at the same time an opponent of a gross sensual form of it." They have been fully vindicated (as we showed under the history of the doctrine) from the erroneous charges of carnality bestowed upon them, and this justification comes largely from persons who are not in sympathy with us. Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and many others, speak of our receiving "the glory of God," "conversation and communion and unity of spiritual things with the holy angels," "intercourse with God," "things eternal and incorruptible," "the holy inheritance of God," "the abundance of spiritual good things," etc. The simple fact (comp. Dr. Seiss's *Last Times*, last Ed., p. 335, Note E.) that the most faithful, pure, devoted, holy believers have entertained this doctrine, and attributed the greatest spirituality to the future visible Kingdom of Jesus and His saints, should forbid the charge of carnality, seeing that in it a distinguishing, pre-eminent characteristic is constantly held forth, viz., the religious and the divine element—the Supernatural and holy exercising an all-pervading influence. We leave Dr. Greswell (quoted by Seiss) to give the decided opinion: "If I can form any reasonable conjecture about the sentiments of the advocates of the Millennium, in ancient times, from such of their writings as have come down to us—if I know anything of the opinions of the most rational and sober-minded of its supporters still—and, in particular, if I am not altogether ignorant of my own views and expectations concerning it, I cannot hesitate to affirm that they are very greatly mistaken, or very grossly pervert

and misrepresent our conceptions of the nature and purposes of this dispensation, who charge us with entertaining a sensual and carnal idea of the Kingdom of Christ, and attempt to raise a prejudice against us on that account."

Obs. 3. We ask our opposers to be very guarded, if reverent believers of the Word, in their denunciations of our doctrine, lest, peradventure, they be found to disown and disparage God's own appointments. Will such reflect that a *Theocracy* was established only by God Himself, and that when again restored it is a work that *He alone* can and will perform. In the very nature of the case a Theocracy is not a human government but one set up by God, and its form of government comes from Him and pertains to Him. It is, therefore, not carnal, for the authorship, supporter, and Ruler forbids this; and it is not purely spiritual, for its necessary sway (to meet the conditions of covenant and prophecy) is over the Jewish and Gentile nations. Much confusion unnecessarily arises on this point by not observing the nature of a Theocracy, the intent that it is to subserve, and that it must, in consequence of its divine connection and Head, be pervaded with spirituality. The simple fact that in a Theocracy God again dwells with man and becomes truly the earthly Ruler, is sufficient of itself to sustain our Prop.

It is a matter of surprise to find some persons eulogizing in the highest manner the spirituality connected with the Theocracy, once established (praising the noble characters produced, the lofty writings given, the astonishing exhibitions of the divine, etc.), but just so soon as they come to this future Theocracy, reinstituted by the Messiah with mighty additions, they find no spirituality in it. It assumes "the carnal" aspect. If sincere in their Theocratic raptures in the one case, we see no justifiable reason why they should not be continued when contemplating a Theocracy still future, that shall be far, far superior to the former one in its associations, surroundings, manifestations, and accomplishments. The Theocracy as covenanted and to be established in the future is made pre-eminently spiritual by its King and associated Rulers, by its civil or political being pervaded by righteousness, and by the divine exerting a supreme, controlling influence. The question of 2 Chron. 6 : 18 being then affirmatively answered, alone decides the question of spirituality.

Obs. 4. The perfect and harmonious union of Church and State, an essential in a Theocracy under the Headship of Jesus, the Mighty One, is in itself evidence of the correctness of our position. Here we find a blending of the material and the spiritual, of the outward and the inward, the external and invisible, and a separation of these cannot be made *without violating the union* that God has proclaimed shall be made. The Church insures the highest attainable religious culture; the State, the greatest civil advancement; while *both*, the most advanced stage of spirituality and material good. These are inseparable in the coming Messianic Kingdom, and we cannot, if grounded in covenant and prophecy, conceive of any other kingdom that is promised.

Men do assume, however, to find another, a pure spiritual one, which is found exclusively outside of the Divine Record. Such an exclusive spiritual Kingdom, either in the third heaven or some invisible and unknown locality or sphere, is not the one covenanted (for that is the restored Davidic); it is not the one predicted (for that is the restored Davidic); it is not the one promised to the saints (for that also is the restored Theocracy, in which they bear rule). The general analogy of Scripture forbids it, and to wrest a passage, or several, from this analogy and press them to do service in upholding such a spiritualistic theory is to pervert the entire tenor and logical connection of Scripture. Hence we cannot receive the views of Barbour and others (Prop. 116, Obs. 6 and 7),

who press the idea of spirituality to an extreme, vitiating the covenanted relationship. There is only one (Prop. 35) Messianic Kingdom covenanted and predicted—not two, one visible and the other invisible—here *on* the earth. Homogeneity (Prop. 104, Obs. 2, S. 19, note 1, and S. 20) demands it, and hence, in predictions like Daniel, this Kingdom is outward, external, visible, just as the preceding empires ; and hence also the promises (as the twelve Apostles ruling over the twelve tribes) include a visible reign. The acts ascribed to the Kingdom and its rulers, the central place of government, the laws promulgated, its territory and subjects, etc., all exhibit the same ; not something ideal or mystical, but a real state manifested visibly with increased spirituality.

Obs. 5. Would David's Son, the glorified and exalted Son, come to this world to inherit a carnal Kingdom? Or, would He come to inherit a purely spiritual one? Neither of these would meet the terms of *the expressed inheritance.* While His inheritance by direct covenant (Prop. 49 and 122) is the downfallen throne and Kingdom of David, to which all other nations are added (and hence necessarily in the world), it shall be cleansed. The nation itself that formed the basis of the throne and Kingdom will be purified and believing. It becomes, however external, an holy inheritance, and the holiness is so great and extended, that one of the prophets (as if purposely to meet such objections), magnifies it before us by representing (Zech. 14 : 20, 21) that even the smallest and trivial objects are to be regarded holy.

We say this: when even the bells on the horses have the same inscription which sparkles on the diadem of the High Priest—and this, as the context shows, after the Coming of this King and His saints, etc.—is it not time for men to cease their excuses on the ground of carnality or of exclusive spirituality? While the inheritance of Jesus —with which saints are associated as co-heirs—contains and manifests a glorious spirituality, no man, without vitiating the covenant and prophecy, can show that it is not also outward, external, material. If language has any definite meaning, it is an inheritance here *on* the earth, embracing nations, having a world-dominion, and yet while *in* the world it is not *of* the world, as its Origin and Head indicate. While natural in some of its aspects, it is governed and permeated by the Supernatural.

Obs. 6. Consider that in this Kingdom, of which the elect nation is the basis and the other nations willing subjects, the glorified Son of David is King and His glorified brethren are co-rulers, and from the very nature and exaltation of the heads of government, we clearly perceive the spirituality allied with it. Resurrected, translated, glorified, immortal rulers must exhibit in their official stations, actions, rule, intercourse such a divine mind, such a holy spirit, such a refinement of pure affection, that the Kingdom under their jurisdiction becomes permeated, controlled, and established in a spirituality, arising from the mental, moral, and religious, exceeding our present ability to grasp.

In reference to the direct personal connection of the saints with the Kingdom, see e.g. Props. 154 and 156, and for the visibility of the Theocracy, such Props. as 111, 116, 117, 122, etc. Some few writers, as Barbour (*Three Worlds*), make the Kingdom that the saints inherit something very different from the covenanted and predicted Theocratic-Davidic, which is the special inheritance of Jesus (and, of course, pertaining to His co-heirs). Leaving the general analogy of the Scriptures, they base their view on a few isolated passages, totally misapprehending their meaning. Thus they tell us that the Kingdom inherited by the saints is a higher spiritual one, and assign such reasons as the following : No one can enter or see the Kingdom of God unless born of water and the Spirit. To this we answer, this is true of the saints, of the Jewish and Gentile nations, for all to become qualified for this Kingdom must experience a regeneration (that of the saints, in view of their station, a higher moral and physical one), for repentance, faith,

and holiness *is characteristic* of the Theocracy. Again : they say " flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." To this we reply : most certainly, because this pertains alone to the *inheritors* of a Kingdom (not to the subjects), fitting and qualifying them for their immortal, Christ-like rulership. Again : the greatest stress is laid on the contrast between " a natural and a spiritual body," the assumption being, without proof, that the latter is of such a nature that it cannot be allied, without degradation, to this restored Theocracy as a constant and visible auxiliary and glory pertaining to it. Hence *another* Kingdom, or higher plane, separate and distinct from the other is invented (utterly untaught in the Scriptures, and simply wrongfully inferred), and the saints, glorified, are carefully placed in it because they have no " natural " but " spiritual " bodies. There is an entire misconception of the meaning of the terms ; the one, natural, refers to a body under the control and laws of nature, the other, " spiritual," to a body under the control and laws of Spirit. The spirituality of the latter adapts the co-heirs for their positions of honor, trust, and glory. The mystical conceptions of such writers—however they may pride themselves on their conceptions of " the spiritual " above others—are discarded by the Word of God in that it announces, as we have abundantly proven, but *one* Kingdom of God, embraced in " the sure mercies of David," and which contains the salvation of the saints, the Jewish nation, and the Gentile nations. Any other Kingdom, however derived from a few disconnected passages, is mythical, and destroys the unity that God's Spirit places in this *one* Kingdom. All difficulties vanish when the student observes that in this Kingdom there are higher and lower orders to carry out its end.

Obs. 7. The Priesthood of the saints (Prop. 156), a Royal Priesthood, evinces the same. The baptism of the Spirit then (Prop. 171) experienced, declares unmistakably the pervading, and powerfully contained spirituality. The worship that shall then be tendered to God by the saints, by the Jews and Gentiles, demonstrate a similar conclusion. The redemptive work pertaining to the race, going on under the auspices of this Christ and His brethren, demands from us a like deduction. The end contemplated by this Theocracy, in the glory of the Father, Son, and Spirit, in the honor and blessedness of the saints, in the welfare and happiness of the race, this proclaims, as a constant abiding agency for so grand a result, the highest spirituality.

A number of references seem to intimate a connection of the spiritual with the natural. Thus e.g. that remarkable passage in Matt. 26 : 29, " But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth *of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom.*" Now, however, men may say, " This expression is figurative, signifying the highest happiness," we are not so certain of its figurative nature (comp. Steir, *Com. loci*), because the act and direct reference to " *this fruit* of the vine" would indicate the contrary. The representation given in the transfiguration (comp. Prop. 153) likewise confirms our position.

Obs. 8. The wondrous power exerted by this Theocratic ordering in its King and associated rulers, so that it even extends to the deliverance of creation, the final and complete removal of the curse, exhibits a spirituality far beyond our comprehension. A recreative and beneficent force is then at work, which frees groaning nature itself from its load of suffering and corruption. The Divine and the human, the Creator and the creature are again *in full communion and sympathy.* The separation, once existing and so full of pain and misery, is now removed.

Turn e.g. to Prop. 120, and see how, if ever the Millennial predictions relating to the Kingdom are verified, it demands an extraordinary, supernatural, spiritual exertion of power, and that in and through the appointed Theocratic King. Then, as a contrast, read the following illustration of spiritualizing away the promises of God. After effectually spiritualizing the first resurrection, Smyth (*Key to Rev.*, p. 352) adds : " His reign (Christ's) *must* be only spiritual. The days of miracles are past ; the Bible is filled ; and

they are not needed ; and Christ can reign as effectually without miracles as with them.'' But *how then* are the promises of God pertaining to this very reign to be fulfilled ; to do this requires far more than a mere spiritual reign over the heart. This is taking a low estimate of the grand results involved in that predicted reign, and we turn away from it with relief, accepting of a better hope, of a reign *far more comprehensive and sublime* in its effects and consequences.

Obs. 9. The *remarkable, astounding outpouring of the Holy Spirit* as presented in the Millennial descriptions (Prop. 171, etc.), so powerful in its transforming, glorifying, and imparting miraculous gifts to the saints ; so pervading in and over the Jewish nation that all shall be righteous from the least to the greatest ; so wide-reaching over the Gentiles that they shall rejoice in the light bestowed ; and so extended in its operation that the whole earth shall ultimately be covered with glory—this, with the magnificent portrayals of the Millennial and succeeding ages, is so sublime with the indwelling, abiding, communicated Divine, that no one can contemplate it, without being profoundly moved at the display of spirituality.

Aside from Jesus and the saints, who are the kings and priests, the Millennial descriptions give us such an universal prevalence of holiness in the Kingdom, that every rank and every class are under its influence. This holiness, too, is represented as entering in and infusing all relations of life, civil, social, family, religious. Here we find God and His law restored to their due supremacy, to their rightful place in the hearts and minds, the thoughts and actions of the subjects. Through this grand instrumentality of Theocratic power and love, the earth itself shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God. This, this can only be accomplished, as the Scriptures teach, by a union of the Supernatural and the natural, the divine and the human.

Obs. 10. We insist, in strict accord with the Scriptures, that this spirituality is manifested, *not* in the third heaven, *not* outside of this world, but *in* this world, *upon* this earth. Some writers (as Auberlen, etc.) carefully return (where do we read of such a "return") Christ and His saints, after their Coming to the third heaven from whence they rule ; others (as Seiss, etc.), have Jesus and His saints in the air ruling from thence. This evidently is done under the mistaken idea that a higher degree of spirituality is thus given to them. But this is to misapprehend the Divine Sovereignty for the distinctive covenanted and predicted Theocratic Kingdom on earth in which David's Son is to rule (and, therefore, of His co-heirs it is said, not that they rule in the third heaven, or in the air, but *on* earth). The Davidic throne (on which Jesus, as the Son of Man is to sit) and Kingdom (in which He abides to govern) to be restored, is neither in the third heaven nor in the air. It is something visible, outward, world-extended, and to this, as the controlling, exalting, and ennobling element, is added the glory of the highest possible order of spirituality. Hence, we dare *not separate* that which God has united, nor venture to improve by additions that which He has given.

We are perfectly willing to place Jesus at His return in His covenanted inheritance and to have Him rule in it—not away from it personally—where covenant, prediction, and promise place Him and the saints. (Comp. e.g. Props. 48, 49, 122, etc., where this objection is also noticed.)

We vastly prefer (as Hofman, etc.) to place the King and His glorified ones *in*—as a glorious essential part—and not *outside* of the Kingdom, for such a position alone meets the plain grammatical meaning of Scripture promise on the subject. Let men deride such a view, or be loath to accept of it, one thing is self-evident, that, unless realized in

such a manner, a sense or definite meaning given to language by God Himself *will never* be fulfilled. As we have the one sense God-given, and the other is simply inferred or conjectured (seeing that not a particle of Scripture proof can be given in its behalf), we rest content and hopeful in the one received. We believe that the presence of this King of kings alone (aside from any other consideration) will give His inherited Kingdom such a glory of spirituality, in His glorified form, in His wonderful personage, in His displaying the invisible Godhead, in His exercise of power, and blessing, and grace, and work, and love, that it exceeds our present comprehension. The delights of personal union with the King in His beauty must first be experienced ; the supreme happiness of inheriting with Him personally must first be enjoyed ; the unspeakable honor of kingship and priesthood must first be worn in His loving service ; the glory of Jesus, transcendantly great, must first be reflected from ourselves, and *then*, with His likeness and glorification and princely gifts, we can properly estimate and appreciate the spirituality of His Kingdom. May we, through abounding grace, become worthy to attain unto it !

PROPOSITION 198. *This doctrine of the Kingdom confirms the credibility and inspiration of the Word of God.*

Having given some statements referring to inspiration (Prop. 5), it is proper at this stage of the subject after having passed in review the great leading doctrine, that of the Kingdom, to see whether we do not find strong additional proof in favor of a divine inspiration.

At the outset it confirms the Personality of the God of the Old Test. over against the making it "the deification of a principle, or power, or law," because the Rulership in the Theocracy forbids any other conception. It explains and enforces the characteristics assigned to this Ruler in the record as legitimate, as e.g. the condescension of the Ruler in exhibiting (what unbelief correctly alleges) "the Patriot God," who makes the enemies of Israel His own, and who is accessible to consultation, entreaty, etc.; for if indeed "the King of the Jews" as claimed, *if the Head of a Theocracy*, these things correctly follow as a proper result. If these were missing, then infidelity itself would seize upon it as palpable evidence that *no* Theocracy ever existed. The same is true of the Personality of "the Christ," the Coming Theocratic King, and shows that "the apparently contradictory portraits of our Lord which we find in the Gospels" (so Butler in *The Fair Haven*) arise, not from what writers vainly imagine (viz., in contradiction of the evangelists), but from viewing Jesus *either* as David's descendant in the Theocratic line of earthly kings, or as God's identifying Himself with Him in the Theocratic ordering which in mercy incorporated the former—the one feature revealing the human and the other the divine element—both being requisite for symmetry as *the covenanted* Theocracy demands. No pure Theocracy can exist without God being the Ruler; no pure Theocracy as solemnly presented by the oath-bound covenant of God can arise in the future without David's descendant being the King—hence *both* are united in the one Person, called in consequence "*the Christ*." This paves the way to consider "inspiration" and the objections urged against it. For a masterly vindication of the Personality of God, see Prof. Frohshammer's review of Strauss's "The Old Faith and the New," partly quoted in *Brit. Quarterly*, Jan., 1874, p. 31, etc.

Obs. 1. Passing by the evidence produced by Leland, Newton, Fuller, Gregory, Keith, Alexander, Horne, and others, another of great strength is afforded by the doctrine of the Kingdom, which, if intelligently considered, stamps the Word as truly divine, and binds the whole from Genesis to Revelation into *one connected* chain. In this chain, link after link *consecutively follows* without a single flaw, so forged and joined, and at separate stages, as to form a symmetrical whole. Notice: (1) the Abrahamic covenant out of which arises the Kingdom; (2) the Theocracy in its initiatory form; (3) the change by incorporating the Davidic line through which it was to be exerted; (4) the overthrow of this Kingdom; (5) the prophecies and preaching touching its restoration under David's Son; (6) the distinguishing peculiarities of this Son; (7) the postponement of this Kingdom, and the reasons assigned for the same; (8) the unity of expression in reference to the time of its re-establishment, viz., at the Sec. Advent; (9) the work that is to be performed during this period of postponement; (10) the condition of the Jewish nation during this time;

(11) the ultimate restoration of the Kingdom as given by covenant, prophets and apostles in perfect agreement. These are some of the salient points presented, and, judging from the history of human nature as presented outside of the Bible, it is *incredible* to believe that such a statement of Divine Purpose could be given by men widely separated in time with human prejudices, weaknesses, etc., without contradictions *unless divinely guided.* To illustrate our meaning: unless the Kingdom itself is part of the Divine Plan, *how* could Moses predict its temporary overthrow, the calling of the Gentiles, and its subsequent restoration? *How* could the prophets after its downfall predict its long continuance in such a condition, the period of Gentile domination, the gathering out of a people, the restitution at the Coming of the Messiah (not in humiliation but) in glory? *How* could Jesus proclaim its postponement and direct us as proof to a constantly abiding historical fact, that of the treading down of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the nation? *How* could Jesus, against the most stubborn prejudice and national pride, preach the fall of the nation, the grafting in of Gentiles, and the delayment of the Kingdom to the Sec. Advent? These are a few, out of a multitude of similar questions, that *must first* be answered before inspiration is denied. The Kingdom, its past, present, or future state, forms *the key-note* of Revelation, and in no instance do we find the writers involving themselves in expressions relating to it that are *antagonistic* to each other. The intelligent student will see, that it is against the national pride and love—against the noblest instinctive impulses of nature in its social aspects—that men for ages have predicted the down-trodden, despised condition of their own nation and Kingdom, and that consequently we must seek and find a reason of sufficient weight to influence speech and action *the very opposite* of that which is the natural outgrowth of humanity. Rationalism, if consistent with its own professions, and if really desirous of being philosophically correct, must not overlook but *ought to account* for this remarkable feature in the history alone of one nation on earth. The men who describe the Divine Purpose—against and in denouncement of the present natural wishes of the people then existing—profess to do it by inspiration. Unless it can be shown that such a consecutive plan, in itself opposed to the wishes, etc., of the nation, would be suggested by reason, or is a natural result flowing from the powers of man, it is *the most reasonable* to accept of the only explanation which thus far alone covers the ground, viz., that of inspiration. It certainly is unwise, even unscientific or unphilosophical to discard a reason which is admitted to meet the exigencies of a case until a better one is substituted.

It is refreshing to notice the coolness of certain statements made in behalf of unbelief, or in Broad Church theology. Thus e.g. the *Westminster Review* (Ap., 1874, p. 244), speaking for a class, takes the position: "Science *is*, and religion *claims to be*, based upon facts. The foundation of the one *has been*, and that of the other *is to be*, experimentally verified. As soon as *this is* done, the feud between science and religion will be at an end." Unfortunately, while facts and merely alleged ones—the latter inferred, assumed, and far-fetched—in science are eagerly seized and admitted, provided they can have any bearing, even the most remote, against religion, *the facts* relating to the Word are persistently denied, although history is full of them and the present time exhibits them. It *is human nature;* and the feud will *never end* until "the Christ" comes to end it. It is painful to observe how vigorous intellects take a wide departure from the primitive Church interpretation, in the honest but hopeless mystical effort to bridge over the chasm between Supernaturalism and modern forms of unbelief. Thus e.g. Arnold's *Literature and Dogma* (comp. criticisms as in *Westm. Review*, Ap., 1874) or the efforts of

Fowle in *The Reconciliation of Religion and Science* (which, admirable in some respects, is weakened by assuming the modern phase of thought over against the grammatical rendering of the Word). Such efforts, well intended, are depressing, because laboring at a compromise which more or less *sacrifices* Scripture. The truth is, and may as well be expressed, that as liberals, on the one hand, and orthodox on the other, have asserted, there is *no middle ground* for compromise—either the claims of the Bible *as a whole* must be received, or else rejected, for just so soon as man sets himself up as a judge to discriminate between these claims, tolerating some and refusing credence to others, *then* the Bible *suffers* in its integrity, authority, and power. It is very sad to find Apologists of eminence (as e.g. Row in "Ch. Evidences," *Bampton Lectures*, 1877, p. 432, etc.), who, in order to avoid conflict with theories of science, make inspiration to be "not a general but a functional endowment, and consequently limited to subjects in which religion is directly involved, and that in those which stand outside of it the writers of the different books in the Bible were left to the free use of their own faculties." If this were properly limited (as we have shown previously) it might be accepted. But it is so generally framed in order to assist the endeavor to escape objections urged against Revelation by physical science and modern criticism, and how the religious element (as e.g. in the sun and moon standing still, etc.) is to be separated from the other subject we are not informed. Indeed it does not help (as e.g. in creation, the deluge, etc.) the matter a particle, but only gives unbelief *a leverage* to cut out of the Divine Record whatever it concedes does not directly involve religion. The discrimination is left, more or less, at the option of the student, and, to say the least, is a dangerous procedure. Most excellent men, however, take this ground, and the result is that much which belongs to the integral part of Revelation is assigned to human faculties, the reason of the writer.

Obs. 2. Much has recently been said concerning (what Locke, *Ess. Hum. Unders.* B. 4, ch. 18, calls) "traditional revelation;" doubts being cast upon the credibility, reliability, inspiration, etc. of the Word by confining us to *isolated* facts or *detached* portions (the favorite tactics of numerous writers) of it. It is a fact, however, worthy of especial notice that not one of our opponents from the early Church down to the present day has ventured to consider the Bible *as a whole*, as containing *one continuous plan*, and has noticed the Rise, Progress, and Result *purposed* by it. In this consists *the strength* of the Bible; in this is found *the great and overwhelming proof* of its inspiration. Surely the able men who have hitherto endeavored to undermine its authority by attacks on its outworks, or by objecting to certain details of it, do not elevate the standard of reason, which they profess to follow, *so long* as they refuse to receive into consideration and carefully study (for reception or refutation), the Word in the line indicated. The important question to be answered is not whether this or that portion may or may not be defective—but whether the Bible contains a Plan of Salvation *worthy* of God and *adapted* to secure the happiness of man in all his relations—*worthy* of the sacrifice alleged to have been made in its behalf, and *adapted* to the removal of the evils now unhappily burdening the world. While it is reasonable in studying a locomotive to consider its separate portions and descant on their form, etc., it would be folly to confine ourselves only to these and neglect what is of far greater moment to consider, the locomotive as one whole—its capability of performing the work designed by its builder—and then to look at its various parts—not as misshapen or wrongfully constructed when contemplated by themselves irrespective of their designed use—but only in their adaptedness to subserve *the intended end.* This rule of judging holds good in the just estimation that men form of mechanical efforts, scientific pursuits, literary labor, etc., and no valid reason can be assigned why the Bible should form an exception.[1] And yet, it is evident that it is subject to exceptional treatment in the writings of a numerous class; who, so far as

they can intimate the existence of a Plan, admit its desirableness, and even the incorporation of some splendid features, but persistently refuse to trace it *from its beginning to the end contemplated.* We might fill pages of laudatory matter, incidentally presented by the Rationalistic schools, developed by a transient glance at the great, eternal ideas underlying the Divine Purpose as given in the Word, and yet with all these admissions, so courteously given, not one has attempted to grapple with the subject itself. It is true that a lower grade of writers, very different in spirit and style from others, do in general terms pronounce the Bible, including of course its Plan of Redemption, a failure, etc., but in every instance an examination of their works, reveals the fact that such an opinion is derived from a consideration of certain portions of the book without noticing or entering into a thoughtful discussion of *the Plan* which runs through the whole professed Revelation. Have we not a right of appeal to all such, urging them to take *higher ground* in their efforts at criticism. To take a plain, common-sense view of the matter, it seems almost incredible that many of the highest intellects—men of distinguished talent and worthily renowned in their respective spheres—should thus confine themselves to what may be truthfully called *the lowest form* of criticism, and refuse to enter upon what is justly *the highest and most honorable phase.* To illustrate from the figure already introduced : If a man forms his estimate of the worthiness, the purpose, the capability, etc., of a machine only from viewing its several parts separated from the Plan designed by its designer, he is regarded as taking a low position in judgment, and this too in proportion to the complications, the numerous appendages of the machine, thus requiring for correct apprehension a constant reference to the plan. If this is true of things of a material interest, how much more noticeable is this fact, when we see it applied to the greatest of all interests, those relating to humanity, seeing that the Bible professes to be a book given in behalf of man. It is therefore to be hoped that our opponents—many of whom evince the spirit of scholars and affability—will see the propriety and the importance, even from their own standpoint and aims, of shifting their mode of attack from the particulars to the general, the outworks to the main fortification, the details to the whole, or of considering the former only in the light of the latter. Such a mode of attack, or of criticism, is invited on the ground, that if men of intelligence can be led into the requisite preparatory study for it, they will be forced to see that the inspiration of the Word does not depend on what they may regard as exceptionable passages, or on the performance of works which they regard as incredible, but that its foundation, its power, its logical force and consistency appears *in a wonderful Divine Plan,* plainly stated many ages ago ; continuously kept up by a remarkable Providence ; evolved in undoubted historical facts ; evidenced by the present circumstances and condition of the Jewish nation, Church, and the world ; and *never* in any point *contradicted* by numerous writers appointed to convey its mode of progress and result. A *real scholarly method* productive of vast influence, would thus for the first time be presented, commending itself to a careful recognition by the fact that every alleged objection urged against the Bible is duly regarded in its connection with the whole—the stated Divine Purpose—and shown to be defective or unsuitable, to produce the effects or results said to be contemplated by the Almighty. Such a discussion would not only be fair and honest toward the Book itself, but would prove highly interest-

ing both in its sway over the minds of writers and readers. It would at least indicate such a sense of integrity and honor that causes the objector to allow Revelation *to speak for itself in its highest and most essential argument* so that the very form, if thus adopted, would *commend itself* to every one as worthy of respectful and serious consideration.[2]

[1] Philo-Judæus (vol. 4, p. 253, Bohn's Ed.) long ago justly observed : "Those men act absurdly who judge of *the whole* from *a part*, instead of, on the contrary, forming their estimate of *a part* from their knowledge of *the whole;* for this is the more proper way to form one's opinion of anything, whether it be a body or a doctrine ; therefore the divine code of laws is, in a manner, a *united* creature, which one must regard *in all its parts and members* at once with all one's eyes, and one must contemplate the meaning and sense of *the whole* Scripture with accuracy and clearness, not disturbing its harmony nor dissevering its unity ; for the parts will have a very different appearance and character if they are at once *deprived of their union.*" The reader may have noticed the concession even of Dr. Kuenen in his *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State.* After denying the tenableness of belief in Israel's selection (over against the Theocratic ordering, evidenced in a continuous plan, in the preservation of the nation, the present fulfilment of prophecies in their behalf, the continuation of the election in them, etc.) ; after disparaging the covenants, prophecies, etc., under the plea of having at present grander conceptions of God and the universe—he finally tells us : "Although considered *as a whole*, the Old Test. may be *with justice* adduced as testifying in favor of Supernaturalism, its separate parts, regarded by the light of criticism, speaks loudly for a natural development, both of the Israelitish religion itself and of the belief in its heavenly origin." He endeavors to make his admission still more nugatory by adding : "He who relies upon the impressions made *by the whole*, without interrogating the parts one by one, repudiates the first principles of all scientific research, and pays homage to superficiality." Now the simple truth is, that *neither* can be omitted, and Kuenen confines himself only to the one (i.e. to the separate facts), thus making himself liable to the charge indicated. For he and his fellows do not regard the Bible *as a whole;* they do not consider the continuous Divine Purpose, but interrogate the parts as *separate and disconnected from the whole*, and from such work draw inferences, etc. We fail to see any indication of scientific research in a process—which is easy for the most illiterate—that does not allow any assignment of parts to the relation that they severally and individually sustain *to a whole.*

[2] Let us illustrate how the neglect of regarding the Bible as a whole forces men to make unwarranted statements, and how some even who do this cannot wholly rid themselves of its force as a whole. The first point is fairly presented in Dr. Draper (*His. of Conflict*, etc., p. 220), who, over against the Jewish view, the confirmations of Christ and Apostles, etc., says that the inspiration of the Pentateuch was not affirmed "until after the second century," and adds : "It is to be regretted that the Christian Church has burdened itself with the defence of these books and voluntarily made itself answerable for their manifest contradictions and errors." "Their vindication, if it were possible, should have been resigned to the Jews, among whom they originated, and by whom they have been transmitted to us." This exhibits *utter ignorance* of the Bible as a whole, the absence of *due examination* in this direction, and proceeds on the idea that *no vital* connection, no *historical* relationship, no *fundamental union* exists between the Old and the New Tests. It ignores the Plan of Redemption, the building of Christianity on the ground marked out in the books objected to, the constant appeals of the New to the Old in proof of relationship, in brief, the Bible *as a whole.* It, too, is scarcely honest, for if the Church would follow such outrageous advice, then Draper and his fellows would be the first to cast up this relationship and our forsaking the fountain-head of revelation. The regret (?) is simply absurd, and uncritical, and unworthy of Dr. Draper's abilities. The second point is illustrated by Bh. Colenso (*Lectures on the Pentateuch*), who, while engaged in his destructive work, that virtually introduces "cunningly devised fables" as part of the books of Moses manufactured to exalt Jehovah and the Jewish nation, ends each discourse with a long, devout meditation that is expressive *of reverence* for such a record because of profit and instruction derived therefrom through the teaching of Jesus, etc. He cannot, with all his degradation of the Record, *fully rid himself* of the influence which it exerts when viewed *as a whole*, or in its relationship to what follows. Strange manifestations. It is self-evident (as seen e.g. in Stephens's *His. of English Thought in the Eighteenth Cent.*) that one class attacks the external evidences, another the internal, another devotes itself to historical or scientific criticism, but none venture to view the Bible connectedly.

Obs. 3. If our more complaisant and intelligent opponents accept of this evidently just method of procedure, it is proper to suggest that the rules of guidance laid down in the first part of this work—and which coincides strongly with many of their own reiterated statements—must be closely followed. Thus e.g. the grammatical sense must be retained ; the Plan of Redemption as given in the Book and not man's additions must alone be noted ; the varied interpretations as presented by men in extended creeds, systems of theology, etc., must not be allowed to have an undue influence ; the doctrines of the Bible ought to be regarded as professed announcements of truths and not in a germ state to be afterward developed, but truths which stand completed in their relationship to a general design and must be judged by their fitness to produce the result intended. Recognizing an appeal to reason (for God Himself does this) to be proper, it is sufficient to add, that true reason will never make any proposed truth dependent on a mere process of reasoning, for it accepts the universal verdict of wisdom that where a Plan is purposed and drawn out with numerous details, that every announcement and every fact pertaining to it ought to be regarded in the light of its perfect adaptability *to accomplish the end designed*, and thus meet the Plan contemplated. Reason, if true to itself, ought not so much to look at things, or facts, or doctrines, etc., isolated, torn from their connection, but in the relationship that they sustain to a system or purpose. This is true philosophy. Reason is given to discern truth ; and to find out *the whole truth*, the most important part of truth, is to ascertain its bearing or affinity to other and more leading or general truths. It is this feature introduced into science, art, etc., correctly appreciated and carried out, that enhances their interest and value ; and the time has arrived when reason conducting the attack upon, or the defence of Bible statements should firmly plant itself on the same ground, viz., rejecting or receiving alleged truths in their unsustained or sustained relationship to the whole. Thus, e.g. to illustrate our meaning : instead of viewing the miracles of Christ, separate and distinct, from the Divine Plan, let them be regarded as incidental and even *requisite indications of a certain end* which is stated to be accomplished, viz., the restoration of all things, which includes a renewing power over nature, man, etc., and these very miracles appeal to us for acceptance on *higher* grounds than those generally given. It places them in the light entertained by the quite early Church as evidence or "*signs*" that Christ has the power, and that He will accomplish the work assigned to Him. And, reason here finds that instead of being merely arbitrary interferences, they sustain *a just and proper relationship* to the Divine Plan, and are *indicators* of the exercise of that Almighty energy promised in the future. The miracles at the deliverance of the Jewish nation are also thus found to be only indicative of *a still greater exertion* of Supernatural power at the deliverance of that nation still future. The argument for or against miracles thus assumes a position which is of *far greater significancy and force* than any other ; and the argument and reply to be in proper accord must occupy the same plane. The miracles thus form *part of the Plan itself*, and since, as we have shown, the Plan cannot possibly be carried to its completion without their presence, the question that ought to be considered and answered before all others is this : whether, in view of *the necessary* exertion of Supernatural power to produce the ultimate results contemplated by the Divine Purpose, their *absence* would not be a *very serious* defect. Such a line of procedure, honorable

alike to the student and the Word, at once indicates their *reasonableness and importance.* It also serves to sustain, by implication, the inspiration of the Word ; for if it can be shown that they are requisite to the fulfilment of the predicted restitution (still future), their occurrence, especially at the First Advent, afford proof *both* of the ability to bring forth the end designed and of the truthfulness of those who proclaimed their necessary connection with the same. Thus miracles regarded in the light of the wonderful miraculous working of Jesus Christ at His Sec. Coming—taking in the final result—are *essential confirmatory manifestations* that the End will be realized as promised ; and to give them their proper weight and position they must be considered in this aspect. This makes them *both* reasonable and required appendages to the development of God's Plan. The omission of them, in view of the important part assigned to them still future, would indeed form a great objection to the Word, invalidating, according to the requirements of reason, its professed inspiration. For, if Christ is the One who is to restore or renew all things, as the prophets all testify, then when He comes even in humiliation it is of moment that this miraculous power, alleged to be lodged in Him, should be in some way *evidenced* to influence faith in Him. In other words, taking the portraiture given of the Messiah in the Old Test. Scriptures, the Advent of the same without an exhibition *in some form* of the Supernatural allied with Him, would leave out *an element of identification and trust.* So that on this ground the works of Jesus Christ are confidently appealed to, as proof that He is indeed the predicted Messiah.

The *Theocratic relationship* of the line and nation descended from Abraham made a manifestation of the Supernatural, and hence the miraculous, a necessary consequence. God condescending to become the earthly Ruler of the Jewish nation, it was *reasonable* that that very form of manifestation of power (which other nations justly supposed a prerequisite of God-like interest and union in human affairs, and therefore appropriated in their mythologies) should be given as evidence of *the reality* of such a kingly relationship. Moses specially entreated that it should be excited in their guidance and protection, and we fail to see *how a Theocracy* could be established and carried on without its conjunction. It is in view of this special nearness of God to this nation that even Ewald (*Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott*) admits, however much he may sympathize with Rationalism in some particulars, that the prophetic revelations given to Israel are to be distinguished and elevated above those claimed by other nations. But this Theocratic feature extends not merely to 'a miracle of knowledge' (prophecy), but to all miracles. Take e.g. the one that is the particular object of ridicule from men proud of their science, viz., Joshua (Jos. 10 : 12–14), commanding the sun and moon to stand still, the language being that adapted to a popular method (as illustrated by some writers in referring to the Greek of Acts 27 : 27 "some land was nearing them" —i.e. not that the land literally approaches when sailing toward it, etc.), and expressive of the fact that the day was supernaturally lengthened. To consider this miracle *outside of the Theocratic position* of the nation and leader—yea, of God Himself as the pledged Ruler of the nation, is simply injustice to the Word. The Theocratic order makes the miracle a reasonable one, for the King had given His word to aid in an emergency, and when such arose it was right and proper to anticipate the help promised. The simple narrative shows that Joshua, who acted as God's agent, deeply felt and realized *this Theocratic* relationship, and under the depth of conviction and feeling—impelled by the occasion, —he "spake to the Lord," that is, turns to his King for help, and from the assurances arising from faith in that King, or from the reception of the Spirit, utters the command to the sun and moon, and God, the King ordered the *intent* (viz., to lengthen the day—the light), of the command to be carried out, thus proving—not miraculous power alone but—*His Theocratic relationship* to the nation and His faithfulness, "for the Lord hearkened to the voice of a man ; for the Lord fought for Israel." The miracle then, instead of being unreasonable, is *precisely* what ought to be anticipated in the career of a nation *favored by a Theocracy.* The language itself which bears so heavily the shafts of wit-

lings is not the language of God, but of Joshua, and is such—proving the honesty of the record—as would be used by a man like Joshua in that age of astronomical knowledge, or as would be best adapted to popular conceptions. God takes the intent of Joshua and fulfils it, thus showing that *a veritable Theocracy existed.* Kurtz (*Sac. His.*, p. 155), justly says : "The command of faith is pronounced in the sense which Joshua assigns to the words ; the divine answer is given in the sense in which God understands them." Joshua simply prayed for a prolonging of the day and God gives it. It was not simply faith in God as God, but in God as Theocratic King that produces the result. It is painful to find how Christian apologists of high standing, failing to notice the Theocratic point of view from which the miracle must be regarded, have even condescended to adopt the Rationalistic conceit that Joshua's command is a piece of poetry ! an ebullition of Oriental extravagance ! Liberals (*Westm. Review*, etc.), make themselves merry over the late "Speaker's Commentary" yielding up the miracle, and adopting Ewald's notion of poetic language, and well may they do so, when exegesis can fall so low as to travesty a narrative so plainly recorded. The old explanation as given by Horne (*Introd.* vol. 1, p. 421), and others, is immensely preferable to such a degrading process. Let the student consider several points : (1) That unless the Supernatural shine forth in some way before the nation, it could not fairly be evidenced that a Theocracy existed ; (2) that if the Supernatural in direct aid, etc., were lacking, infidelity would appeal to this as positive proof that a pure Theocracy never existed ; (3) that the general feeling of heathen nations has been, that the nearer the approach to a Theocracy, the more of the miraculous ought to be witnessed ; (4) that the question of probability drawn from the relationship of the two parties is too much neglected in this discussion ; and (5) that this miracle, like all others is only "a sign" of something which is to come, for as Joshua was a type of Jesus, so when Jesus comes as "the man of war," we have in this very miracle—over which so many foolishly jest—"a sign" of the wonder-working arm of Him who is finally to lead on God's people to deliverance, and to a complete overwhelming of God's enemies. (May we also add, that it teaches us what to think of able Apologists, who fritter away answers to prayer as coming only in the line of natural causes (as e.g. Row's *Bampton Lectures*, 1877, "Ch. Evidences"), notwithstanding such examples, the promises of Jesus to prayer, the ministry of angels, etc.). We are not especially concerned in the manner by which God answered the intent of Joshua, whether by a miraculous exertion of power on the planet, or by a special Supernatural reflection of light only confined to Palestine, etc. (because no details being given, we know not the precise method employed), but we are concerned in insisting that the historical narrative does present us the miraculous power of *a then present Theocratic King.*

Looking at Jesus Christ as a God-man (given by unlearned men) and admitting a First Cause—a God—a Creator, it certainly is no evidence of intellectual strength (as seen even in Hamilton, Mill, etc.), or of correct reasoning, to refuse to believe that *such a Being*, thus formed, can at pleasure subject nature to His own Will in the matter of change, etc., especially when this is done in the interest of man against an admitted disturbing element (evil), and to subserve moral purpose. Which is the most reasonable, to portray such a Being meeting the exigencies of the world, or to elevate the world by a mechanical conception, by a rigorous law of uniformity, *above* the mighty Designer and Lawgiver ? Which is the most reasonable to suppose that moral beings, subject to great and heartrending evils, should be totally left to shift for themselves without some special aid, made necessary by their condition, from a moral Governor, or to ignore the moral and lay down the principle that the Divine must only be measured by the human, and that intellectuality (the inductions and deductions of reason, and even the determinations of the will, etc.), is a natural product, purely the result of natural progression ? Which is the most in accord with reason, to have a Saviour, such as these "unlearned men" give to us, admitted if He really possess the attributes attributed to Him to be adapted for purposes of salvation, or to close the door to all hope excepting what natural development—which cannot save from death, etc.—may suggest ? Thus, in correspondence with what preceded, we find converging testimony in favor of the portraiture given of Jesus, underlying the constitution of things and arising out of the moral necessities of man. We need not even press against Rationalism its own picture of Jesus, when it gives "the perfect, ideal man of humanity" which includes freedom from sin, etc., without a single hint or explanation *how* by the laws of naturalism or development such a pure Being could suddenly appear out of the surrounding mass of depravity, and could as suddenly disappear without continued reproduction in the same form. This, to say the least, is an indication of weakness in argumentation, while the demand is solved by these supposed "unlearned" writers, and until an explanation is given more satisfactory

to reason, reason is justified in accepting of it. We are confident of one thing, viz., that the Supernatural Saviour of the Bible is the only one *adapted* to save us from the conclusions of Shopenhauer, Von Hartman, and others—that there is and ever will be an uninterrupted continuance of evil under natural law, and that misery grows with consciousness, intelligence, and knowledge. That, however, which above all others meets the objections of Celsus and Porphyry, Voltaire and Gibbon, Hume and Strauss, Huxley and Tyndall, and many others, is *a personal practical experience* of the preciousness of Jesus by faith in Him as the Redeemer, for the results in heart and life are such that the believer possesses in himself *a conclusive* personal evidence of the truth and divinity of the Scriptures. The attacks of unbelieving science do not effect him, for he realizes the truth in God's dear Son, and he is content, believing that in the ultimate outcome all things—even those supposed to be antagonistic—will be found to be in harmony with Revelation, either, on the one hand, by science enlarging its views and changing its deductions ; or by faith, on the other hand, rightly apprehending the divine teaching and changing its conclusions ; or by the Advent and its additional revelations affording us the light needed for a complete reconciliation. The experience derived from God in His Son gives the philosopher and ignorant, the learned and unlearned, *the same assurance.*

Obs. 4. But to make our argument logically correct, let us turn to the great, leading doctrine of the Word, viz., that of this Kingdom, which presents to us what really is the Divine Purpose. The Kingdom being the burden of prophecy, *the End* which God has in view in the preparatory measures and dispensations introduced, and *the goal* toward which all things tend, it is of *the utmost importance* that in a discussion involving the inspiration of God's professed Word, two things should be observed : (1) that a proper knowledge and estimate of the Kingdom itself should be attained, and (2) that in virtue of this Kingdom being the End proposed in the Redemptive process, all other announcements, facts, etc., must be regarded in their relationship to it. Casting aside the numerous meanings fastened upon the Kingdom by men, let the plain idea, the simple notion of it so characteristic of the Old Test. (as admitted by Rationalism and by Orthodoxy, however it may be afterward explained by them) be retained ; then let it be traced in its initiatory establishment, its overthrow, its promised restoration, its predicted glory, etc.,[1] and with all this before the mind, let reason carefully examine its design, its merits, its adaptability to secure the deliverance of man, the race, and the world, and reason must confess that if carried out according to the pre-determined programme laid down in the Word, it will *fully and most perfectly* meet the wants and the desires of humanity. Concerning the latter there can be no question, seeing that it embraces within itself not only the deliverance of man individually, but that of society in its highest and most extended relations, including that of a world now subject (explain it as we may) to evil. The intelligent reader knows that many pages could be filled with admissions taken from Rationalistic writings acknowledging that the conceptions of the Kingdom as given by the prophets form "a splendid, gorgeous dream," and one too most desirable to humanity, if it could only be realized. We are not now concerned with the question why it was not fulfilled (for this is answered under Props. 56–68) but only with the fact, that no man can read the descriptions pertaining to this Kingdom without, if honest, frankly admitting that there is *no phase* of imperfection, suffering, and evil which it does not propose to remove, and that there is *no blessing* which the heart of man has longed for both for himself and society which it does not intend to bestow. Hence it follows, that whether there be faith in the announcements or not, the concession at least follows, that, if it could be

witnessed and experienced, man would indeed find a happy release from tears, sorrow, and death, and that the world itself would undergo the much-wished-for transformation. Here then is the main point upon which all are agreed ; and in the very nature of the case, owing to the precious interests involved, it ought in any scholarly discussion of the Word occupy *the prominency* given to it. Rationalism, if we understand its position, has no fault to find with the blessings contemplated to be introduced by the Kingdom—it admits their desirableness and the great happiness that would inevitably result if thus introduced—but it objects to *the manner* in which they are to be introduced, to *the agencies* by which it is to be effected, and hence refuses credence to their realization, mainly on the ground of a past non-fulfilment, and of its requiring such a Supernatural intervention as cannot be credited. To such we can only briefly indicate a line of investigation that at once removes, in accordance with reason, their objections. Let the condition of man and society be *satisfactorily met* by the Kingdom, then at once the greatest objection that could possibly be urged against Revelation is also met and set aside. This secures the proper leverage for continued investigation. The next point for consideration follows : God intends to secure the salvation of the world *through the establishment of a Theocracy ;* now does the nature of a Theocracy contain the elements *requisite* to meet the conditions in which man is placed in all its relations? Is it desirable, admitting for the time the idea of a Creator (which Rationalism so largely indorses), that God should condescend to act in the capacity of an earthly Ruler ; that He should manifest the same through some chosen instrumentality ; that He should thus establish a permanent, world-wide dominion, etc.? Surely there is nothing in the idea of a Theocracy but what *commends itself* both to the intelligence and the desires of the student ; it being *a want* which the world has long felt and acknowledged ; and which, not being now visibly manifested, is presented by some forms of infidelity as a reason why God's direct interference with human affairs is denied. Our argument accepts of this reason as a correct one, provided (1) it can be proven that no Theocracy ever existed, and (2) that no Theocracy shall ever again exist. The first is evidenced (*a*) by history ; (*b*) by the reasonableness of representations ; (*c*) by its design and prosecution (for its failure so candidly stated, with reasons assigned so humiliating to the nation, go far to prove its verity) ; (*d*) the conjoining in some form of the Supernatural with the human, indicative of the Divine being really present, as shown e.g. by prophecy, etc. The latter is proven, by (*a*) the connection it sustains to the former ; (*b*) the utterances given concerning it confirmed by prophecy and its resultant history ; (*c*) the provision made and now in progress for its re-establishment ; (*d*) the valid reasons assigned for its postponement ; (*e*) the condition and preservation of the chosen nation with which it is identified ; (*f*) the gathering out of a select body to be incorporated with the Kingdom ; (*g*) the entire unity of purpose closely observed in all the declarations respecting it. These are some of the things which ought to be calmly studied before coming to a definite conclusion ; and if, peradventure, it should be adverse, the reasoning by which it is reached should be carefully given so that the subject may receive that intelligent review which its importance demands.[1]

[1] Two remarks are here in place. The reader is reminded that in reference to this Theocratic Kingdom we have (1) the fact that it once existed in connection with the

Jewish nation ; (2) that it incorporated the Davidic line with special promises of enlargement, grandeur, etc., under a descendant of David ; (3) that it was overthrown, owing to the sinfulness of the nation, as a punishment ; (4) that it was not re-established at the first Advent, and the reasons are given in their plain historical connection ; (5) that it was postponed to the Sec. Advent, and that such postponement is verified by numerous collateral facts connected with it, as e.g. the condition of the Jewish nation, of Jerusalem, of the Church, and of the world ; (6) that *a continuous chain of facts* thus appealing to man's reason, forbids our rejection of faith and hope in the predicted future rebuilding of that Kingdom. Secondly : the doctrine of the Kingdom as presented, shows *why* the form and structure of the Bible is so largely historical and prophetical, and *why* so much stress is laid on the history and future of the Jewish nation. The *Theocratic idea and purpose* require it. The facts in reference to the Kingdom make this feature—considered objectionable and a blemish by some—*a necessity*. It is so historical, because the covenant, the Kingdom, and the downfall demand it ; prophetical, because the assured fulfilment of covenant in the restitution of the Theocracy requires it ; Jewish, because the Theocratic relationship of that nation forbids a departure from it. Hence narrative, prophecy, events connected with the elect nation rather than events related to the vast Gentile monarchies, etc., receive new light in that of *the Theocratic ordering*.

[2] The unbelieving attack makes the Bible to be merely the result of human ideas, the embodiment of natural reason. But here in *the Theocratic idea* we find the fundamental truth which allies the Bible to the Supernatural, which elevates it far above the natural conceptions of the mind, which places it immeasurably in advance of all the thinking of humanity in the past or present. Take the highest thoughts of the sages of Asia, Greece and Rome ; the loftiest conceptions of the philosophers of the world, and they pale before the brightness and splendor of *the Theocratic conception*. There is nothing so magnificent to be found outside of the Bible. Men now endeavor to belittle the Bible by comparing its teaching with ancient religions, and deducing therefrom a common origin of all religions (e.g. Higgens's *Anacalypsis*, etc.), but such writers are very careful not to present the teaching of the Bible which indicates its superiority over all others. Mollock (*Dogma, Reason, and Morality*), and others, have shown that natural religion—universally diffused owing to man's moral and religious nature—only confirms Christianity. We insist that the higher teaching of the latter, and the unity of its Redemptive Plan through a purposed Theocracy, evidences its Supernatural origin, which is abundantly confirmed by the provisions made for a future realization.

Obs. 5. Rationalism admitting that the Kingdom, if realized as predicted, would, of course, secure the deliverance and happiness of the world, must, if in accord with reason, now proceed to ask whether the agencies used and the manner employed to affect this restoration are *adapted* to secure this end. If it can be shown that there is no adaptation in them to obtain such a purpose Rationalism gains the vantage ground ; but if, on the other hand, we can indicate their fitness, and even necessity, then the superiority and logical consistency of argument is on our side. This leads, therefore, to a consideration of the Divine Plan thus far unfolded and carried out. Our object being merely to give an idea how the controversy between Rationalism and Orthodoxy, to bring it to its highest and logical ground of attack and defence ought to be conducted in order to fairly test the merits of each, we pass by many points of interest (which also must be carefully observed as parts of the Plan, such as the Covenants, past history of the Theocracy, the elect position of the Jewish nation, etc., being already presented in previous Propositions) and select several to elucidate the matter.

Take *the Divinity and Humanity* of Jesus, the Christ, and view these, not isolated, disconnected from the Divine Plan, but as forming *an indispensable part* of that Plan, and we have at once the strongest possible proof in favor of the Divinity of Jesus. Observe (1) that, as we have repeatedly proven, this Theocratic Kingdom if ever realized in the form

covenanted under David's descendant imperatively demands One greater than man, identified with God, *ruling as God, immortal and performing the Works of God.* David and all the prophets predict this, so that ancient Jews, Christians, and even many unbelievers (who discard it as "a dream") freely admit it. The Theocratic idea involves this feature, seeing that *the very essence*—that which alone forms it—of a Theocracy is that *of God ruling over men as an earthly ruler.* The burden of prophecy and promise is, that such a rule, the grandest that can be conceived, is to be manifested here on earth through a David's Son who is also to be David's Lord. Here then is the Plan respecting the King of this Kingdom proposed. Is it wise or prudent to discard it without noticing the provision made for its fulfilment? With those predictions before us, covering many bright pages of the Old Test., if there were no additional evidence, if no preparatory measures, insuring an ultimate fulfilment, could be pointed out, then indeed there might be room for doubt and objection. But reason prompts us to proceed, when we find (2) that the birth (miraculous) of Jesus precisely fills *the demands* of the Plan. No such Theocratic King as promised could possibly be raised up by the ordinary laws of nature—it would be an utter impossibility. Here then is a fact, predicted to carry out a certain Plan, which is against the ordinary course of nature; and here is the record that it has taken place. Leaving the arguments usually alleged by theologians to indicate how essential this incarnation was; leaving the eulogies bestowed by Renan and others upon Jesus in view of His purity, nobleness of heart, teaching, etc. (and which could be applied here), it is sufficient only to direct attention to the fact, that by this incarnation alone have we *the Theocratic relationship, as promised, fully united and sustained in one person.* By it God and David's descendant are *inseparably united*, giving the Kingdom an unchangeable Head—in brief, bestowing the very characteristics, attributes, etc., so requisite to carry out the proposed Plan. This at once invests the Person of Jesus with new interest; and the discussion should embrace the evidence whether in Him are to be found *all the qualifications* made requisite by the contemplated Theocratic position assigned. If so—and in reference to this there can be no question so far as it is claimed in the New Test., and freely acknowledged by the destructive critics—this is a decided advance in favor of the Divinity of Jesus; viz., the correspondence existing between Him and the One predicted to be this King. (3) Next let reason judge, admitting for the time the blessings that would most certainly accrue if such a Theocratic Kingdom were manifested under a King possessing such attributes as are ascribed to Him, whether Jesus, the Christ, if such a Being as represented, is not *adapted* in every way *to restore* this Theocratic reign in a most glorious manner, rescuing the dead from the power of the grave, removing evils, etc. In other words, Jesus in every respect is qualified to carry out *the remainder* of the programme as given by the Divine Purpose. He is David's Son as covenanted; He is Divine (Isa. 9 : 6; Zech. 13 : 9; Jer. 23 : 6; Ps. 2 : 7; Rom. 9 : 11; 1 Tim. 3 : 16; Tit. 1 : 3; 1 John 4 : 15; Heb. 1 : 8; 1 John 5 : 20, etc.); He is One and equal with the Father, (John 14 : 7–11; 10 : 30; 12 : 45; 17 : 10, etc.); He is the Image of God, (Phil. 2 : 6; Col. 1 : 15; 2 : 9, etc.); He possesses eternity (Heb. 13 : 18; Rev. 1 : 17, 18); He has Omnipresence (Matt. 17 : 20; 28 : 20, etc.); He is Omniscient (John 2 : 24, 25; Rev. 2 : 23; John 16 : 30, etc.); He is Creator (John 1 : 3, 10; Col. 1 : 16; Heb. 1 : 2, 10; Rev. 3 : 14, etc.);

He in virtue of His divinity has Pre-Existence (John 8 : 58 ; 13 : 3, etc.) ; He is the Preserver (Col. 1 : 17 ; Heb. 1 : 3, etc.) ; He is worthy of worship (John 5 : 23 ; Phil. 2 : 10 ; Heb. 1 : 6 ; Ps. 72 : 15, 17 ; Rev. 5 : 8–13, etc.), etc. Thus to qualify Him to act in the capacity of *a Theocratic King*, everything essential to God is fully ascribed to, and possessed in its fulness by Him. Admitting then the simple record as given, we have *the very Person described* whom the Plan contemplates as the One suitable to act as *the predetermined Theocratic King*. We do not pause now to show how incredible it is that such a Theocratic Plan in all its details, taking centuries for completion and embracing the Advent of such a Person, should have originated unaided in the minds of the ancient writers ; and that at the Advent of Jesus, men against national prejudices and the impulses natural to human nature, should succeed in filling out so accurately in Him the portraiture given by the Prophets. The intelligent reader will take this in account when making up his decision. All that we assert at this stage is, that thus far there is *no discrepancy* between the Plan proposed and the great leading Agency by which it is to be accomplished. Certainly this feature must *commend* itself to reason. (4) Then let reason decide whether such a Being, as we find described in Jesus Christ, is not indispensable to carry out the Plan as given. The Divine Purpose, as we have noticed at length, intends in this restored Theocratic Kingdom to raise up the dead, remove all the evils under which the race is groaning, and renew creation itself. This involves, of necessity, a mighty exertion of *Supernatural power*. The express Agent by which this is to be affected is this promised King. Therefore to give us the most ample assurance that the Plan which embraces such astounding changes shall be verified, the Person Himself is provided through whom it is to be performed. This provision is *a prime necessity ;* reason requires it, for otherwise we cannot see how it is possible to carry out the Purpose intended. This very necessity *thus met in the Person of Jesus the Christ ;* goes far to prove both the Divinity of the Plan and of the Person who claims, by all that is related to Him, to be the One who is ultimately to carry it into execution. (5) Then again—the Theocratic covenant relationship in the line of David necessarily including a God-man, by which the Theocratic idea is *visibly* presented and adapted to man's condition—when that God-man appears on earth, it is most reasonable to anticipate that He would give *some evidences* of the Supernatural thus allied with Him. It is but a low process of reasoning which looks at the Supernatural in the life of Jesus *separated from the conditions imposed* by the previously given Divine Purpose. How can we possibly know that Jesus is the One proposed by the covenant with David, *unless* He in some way, by superior knowledge, works, etc., evinces the lodgment and actual possession of *the Divine* in Himself. Jesus without the Supernatural could not possibly be the promised Messiah. Hence, when we come to the life of Jesus, regarding it simply in the light of what preceded, it is a *just conclusion* to expect, that if it meets the requirements of promise and prediction at all, it must present us with *a strong Supernatural* element. It follows, therefore, that to approach the life of Christ with a prejudged, prejudiced opinion *against* the Supernatural is a most unscholarly procedure.[1] It is uncritical, because it makes no allowance for the connection which this Divine sustains to other matters, and it utterly ignores the Plan of advancement upon which it is based. It is opposed to the true spirit of investigation, preventing an impartial judgment, and

being unjust to covenant, prophets, Jesus Christ and man. The student, observing the personage described and demanded by the Theocratic arrangement, comes to the Advent of a Messiah feeling that the lack of the Supernatural would prove at once *a fatal objection* to His claims; and hence, if disposed to be reasonable and impartial, he will give due consideration to the manifestations of the Supernatural as given in the life of Jesus, ever keeping in view the preliminaries just presented. This, instead of placing him in the attitude assumed by Rationalistic writers (viz., that of prejudging and condemning without a careful summing up of the evidence relating to the subject), enables him to regard *the Plan* which contemplates this particular Theocratic Personage, *the claims* which are presented and that so accurately fit the requirements of it, and then to examine whether the life of Jesus Christ gives *sufficient evidence* to substantiate the claims asserted in behalf of Himself that He is indeed the Messiah proposed in covenant and prophecy. (6) This brings us, finally, to consider how far the life of Jesus gives evidence of the possession of the Divine. In this wide field, the reader must, of necessity, be referred to able works which make this subject a speciality for extended remark. Even the praise rendered to Jesus by Rationalistic writers may be rendered available as circumstantial evidence to the integrity, etc., of the Messiah. Leaving the life, teaching, works, predictions, etc., of Jesus for others to discuss, let us refer to His death, confessed to be sublime by our opponents, and from this alone show the Divinity that existed in Him. That very death which so many now tell us was so unpromising and closed forever (Renan) the hopes and career of Jesus, bears *the unmistakable stamp of the Divine.* Passing by the loving design of that death—(which in itself forms a solid proof)—and the incomparable simplicity of the narrative of His death as alone suitable to portray it—(which could scarcely be imitated by impostors without the introduction of extravagant eulogies, explanations, etc.), let us confine ourselves to *the time* of His death.[2] One of the declarations of Jesus previous to His death was, "I lay down my life that I might take it again; no one taketh it from me, *but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again,*" (John 10 : 17, 18). While His death was desired by Jew and consented to by Roman, while both incurred guilt in engaging in the act and persisting to the end, yet Jesus, according to the record, in virtue of the power lodged within Him, chose for Himself *the moment* when He should yield up His spirit to the efforts of His executioners. This was done, as we are informed for two reasons: (1) This voluntary yielding of His life is essential to His nature as God-man—nothing being able to occur without the permission of the Divine within Him—and such a voluntary offering enhances the value of His priestly office, seeing, as the apostle argues, "it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer," and hence "He gave His life for the sheep." Not being concerned at present to develop the reasons underlying a voluntary sacrifice of Himself, it is sufficient for our purpose to direct attention to the simple announcements that it must be voluntary even down to the very last, and then to the remarkable evidence given in the record that it was indeed such. This is gathered not from a direct circumstantial account, as if given purposely to meet previous statements, but from indirect allusions and references which, from *the very lack of design,* most powerfully confirm the sad story of the cross. It was a voluntary death, thus enhancing its value, not merely in that He

refused to call for the legions of angels at His command, or to exert His Supernatural power for deliverance, but in that He died having the Supernatural within Him *to select the time of departure* without being imperatively, at the crisis, urged to it by the weakness or necessities of nature. Notwithstanding the thirst and pangs endured, the sufferings were not, at the moment of death, sufficient in themselves to cause death as is seen by the surviving of the malefactors, the frequent lingering, long-continued death of crucified persons (the extremities and not the vital parts being first attacked, etc.), the crying out with a loud voice indicative of strength just previous to expiring, and the marvelling of Pilate, when His body was requested by Joseph, that He was already dead, it being so remarkable and unexpected. Here then the evidence in the most *undesigned manner* is given showing unmistakably its voluntary nature, thus corroborating previous predictions relating to it. (2) But now appears the Supernatural, the Divine in the very act of dying, in a most intensely interesting form, viz., *in fulfilling the type of Himself.* Consider *when* Jesus died, at the ninth Jewish hour or at three o'clock in the afternoon, at *the very hour* that the sacrifice should be offered at the temple, at the very time selected and observed for the slaying of the Paschal Lamb. Was it *a mere coincidence* that Jesus died at the very time that the Paschal Lamb, the alleged and significant type of Himself, was slain? Was it an artful presentation of the writers of the Gospels to influence belief in the Messiah? If the latter why then do they not point out the relation that the one sustains to the other, and praise the same? Why do they leave this characteristic relationship to be sought out and ascertained by an acquaintance with the type and the facts as given by themselves? The truth is, that *so transcendantly sublime* is the death of this God-man, that any of the ordinary deviations—so natural to human advocates—to explain relations, to point out significations in detail, and to add expressions of admiration and eulogy, would vitiate the admirable simplicity which *alone* should characterize the divine description *of such a death.*[3] This manifestation of God's love and mercy is so unexampled an exhibition of Divine Power, even when apparently overcome by death, that it is wisely and grandly left *to speak for itself.* It needs no meritricious adornments, no additions to add to its force or value. Even while upon the cross, suffering the anguish incident to crucifixion, the Divine exerts itself (aside from His God-like demeanor, the accurate fulfilment of prediction, etc.), in a silent, impressive, testimonitary manner which alone stamps Him the Messiah. The eye of Jesus, which saw Nathaniel under the fig-tree, which could look into men's hearts and observe their thoughts, looked away over the crowd of Romans, Jews, and friends then around Him, to the temple upon the typical lamb and observed—who can tell with what deep interest—the preparations going forward for the sacrifice; and *when* the time arrived for the type *to die*, the great antitype—yielding to His enemies—*also expired.* It seems to the writer that this deeply significant finale, *pre-eminently worthy of Him*, if regarded in its connections, ought of itself to produce a profound impression that as the centurion, from other evidences less striking, confessed: "*Truly this man was the Son of God.*" The design of this work forbids more than illustrations of the manner in which the life of Jesus must be considered, viz., in its relationship to the Divine Plan. The death of Jesus, in virtue of this, assumes its proper position and significancy, and no discussion, either friendly or hostile, concerning it, is com-

plete or takes a just rank until it embraces this feature. Separated from the Divine Purpose which it is to subserve, detached from the Kingdom which it is designed to secure, it necessarily loses much of its meaning and expressiveness. Thus it is also with the resurrection of Jesus, which is dismissed by so many simply on the ground of its being incredible, without the least attempt to regard it in the light indicated.[4] Its reasonableness, its necessity, its value and preciousness, are not derived from the account given of it and the testimony of witnesses respecting it. These, indispensable as they are to form a connected chain, are only *subsidiaries*. If reason is to exert its highest powers, it will regard the resurrection of Jesus *in its relationship* to the Divine Plan ; noticing, (1) that it is proposed in the Theocratic order ; (2) that it is absolutely required before the Plan proposed can be carried out ; (3) that to attain it, Supernatural power must be exerted ; (4) that this linking of the Supernatural element with the human, —even when dead—(for as we have seen Jesus claimed the power not only to lay down His life but to take it up again) involves such a manifestation of power, that if it really has taken place, there can be no doubt respecting the nature of the Person who has experienced it as the One actually designed ; (5) that admitting the resurrection, as *an outgrowth* of the Plan, (we do not stop now to ask whether Divine or not) it is adapted to evince the ability of Him who experienced it to perform the remainder involved in the Plan ; (6) that if the account of the resurrection was concocted by men to meet the requirements of a previously given Purpose, these writers evince (*a*) an extraordinary clumsiness in stating their incredulity on the subject after the instruction professedly received, (*b*) their ignorance in not pointing out more fully its relationship to the previously given Plan, leaving, in a great measure the reader to infer it ; (7) that the life and death of Jesus must be weighed when the estimate is taken respecting the resurrection ; (8) that the deliverance of man from the power of death, if it really took place, is thus secured, and that we have no knowledge of any other Plan given in all the writings possessed by the world that proposes the same. Let the attitude thus presented be assumed, let the scholar honestly acknowledge concessions, similar in spirit to these suggested, and he approaches the subject of the resurrection with a higher critical resolve, which asks whether it is really an essential part of a previously given Plan, whether it is adapted to secure the results contemplated, whether the manifestation of the Divine through it is worthy of God, and even whether in any other possible way the deliverance of man can be so effectively obtained, etc. Concessions like these are not asked as a favor but demanded as *a simple act of justice* to the Book which records, and to the Person who professes to have experienced, its power. If God-man, if the Messiah as predicted, it necessarily serves to identify Him as such and imparts confidence in Him. The number of witnesses, if sufficient to establish the fact, is of no moment, seeing that the Word wisely depends—thus acknowledging the force of reason—for its reception to its undoubted relationship to the Divine Purpose, and to its perfect adaptedness to obtain for us the promised blessings. Actuated by wisdom the reader ought, in forming an opinion, to consider the initiatory process, the means, and the end.[5]

[1] Take the Lives of Jesus as given e.g. by Renan and Strauss, and it is *self-evident*, that, from beginning to end, the subject has been approached by a previously formed opinion and determination to eliminate the Supernatural element. This, of course, leaves out

"*the Christ,*" resulting from a prejudged attitude, a prejudiced standpoint, and a predetermined wish to lower the Messianic claims. The proof is found in studiously omitting *the connection* of "the Christ" with a continuous Divine Plan, in constantly refusing to discuss *the adaptability* of "the Messiah" as presented to carry out the Divine Purpose, and in purposely *ignoring* all that might cast doubt upon their own deductions, even the language of Jesus as presented. But on the other hand, many of the Lives of Christ, that acknowledge and defend the Supernatural, that contain much that is valuable, are seriously defaced by certain defects. They ignore some of the greatest events in the life of Jesus, and hence utterly fail to present *a consistent and connected* account of His life. Thus e.g. the preaching of the Kingdom is either passed by or perverted, the parables of the Kingdom are philosophized into accommodations to human weakness and ignorance, the postponement of the Kingdom is not touched, the covenant (Davidic) and Jewish forms are despised, etc., and a cloud, under the specious plea of development, is cast over much that is written. Inferences are given as veritable history and a kingdom substituted for the one covenanted and preached. The result is, that infidels (as e.g. Duke of Somerset, ch. 7, *Christ. Theol.* etc.), declare them unreliable, untrustworthy, mere "conjectural histories." A comparison with the Divine Record, if frankly and candidly made, will in some respects, in some aspects, sustain this charge.

[2] Frothingham (*Luth. Observer*, May 31, 1878), is reported as saying, that "Jesus Christ supposed Himself to be the Son of God while He was before Pilate, but found out His mistake when He came to die." We show the Divine, the Supernatural in His death. Newman (*Phases of Faith*, p. 158), pronounces the going of Jesus to a certain death at Jerusalem as a foolhardy and fanatical act. Thus sitting in judgment over, and condemning the sublime act pre-eminently calculated to qualify Him for "the Christship" and its blessed results. Thousands, thousands, alas! take similar low and degrading views of the death of Jesus.

[3] The silence of Scripture in the way of eulogies, explanations, etc., is to the reflecting mind a powerful argument in favor of its divine inspiration, seeing that such a silence is not natural to ignorance, fanaticism, enthusiasm, special pleading—in brief, to man and his impulses. Comp. e.g. Archb. Whatley's *Essays on Certain Peculiarities of the Writings of Paul;* Miller's *Silence of the Scriptures;* Hare's sermon, *What is Better than Bread? Principles Better than Rules;* art. in the *North Brit. Review*, entitled *The Silence of Scripture*, etc.

[4] Thus e.g. Strauss (*The Old Faith and the New*, p. 73) may dogmatically pronounce the resurrection of Jesus "ein Welt historicher humbug," but what is his declaration worth when he ignores *the highest proof* relating to it. The testimony of the Scripture in reference to its relationship to the Divine Purpose, to its connection with a previously arranged and covenanted Plan, to its requisite fitness in the Theocratic ordering—these things, the foundation upon which the resurrection *solidly* rests, are persistently overlooked, as if they did not exist, by this class of writers.

[5] The early Church belief in the Divinity pertaining to Jesus is illustrated by the attack of Celsus, who ridiculed the idea of its existence because of His poverty, sufferings, and death, not realizing the Christian view that as the Human was to be incorporated into a permanent Divine Theocratic ordering, it was essential to indicate its worthiness by making it "perfect in suffering." It is not requisite to lay stress on Horsely's rendering of Isa. 9 : 6 ("God the Mighty man"), or on the fact that in various places in the Old Test. where God is spoken of (as e.g. Zech. 14 : 3, 5 ; Joel 2 : 32 ; Ps. 45 : 6), it is applied in the New Test. to Jesus, or on other proofs, when the simple fact that the Theocratic King Himself—which Jesus essentially is—can be no other than Jehovah, itself *fully and amply* establishes the Divinity of Jesus. In reference to the resurrection of Jesus we may say in addition, as a reply to unbelief which would regard it as an isolated statement, that it was not the result of an afterthought of the disciples, being, as every one can see for himself, an essential part of a predetermined Divine Plan as revealed in the Old Test. and corroborated in the New. The fulfilment of covenant and promise demands its reception, and hence the attitude and foreknowledge of Jesus in relation to it. Fiske (*Unseen World*), indorsing Taine, says, "that the dogma of the resurrection is due originally to the excited imagination of Mary of Magdala." Thus an ignorant Jewish woman, through an "excited imagination," was able to devise *so fundamental* a fact, *essential* in the chain of evidence, to verify covenant and prophecy! Such declarations only evidence, that those making them have never examined the subject, for if eliminated from the Gospels even, it still remains fundamental and essential in the apostolic writings and in its covenanted and prophetic relationship. No one of our opponents has ventured to deal with it in this direction or to examine *the design* intended

by its realization. For a good vindication of the resurrection, Row's "Ch. Evidences," *Bampton Lects.*, 1877, will be found interesting.

Obs. 6. Let us notice the main, leading objection urged by recent writers against the inspiration of the Word and the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Rationalistic writers, justly relying upon the estimate formed by a multitude of the Orthodox (who have rejected the primitive view), declare that the Kingdom covenanted and predicted by the prophets was never set up by Jesus *in the form promised*, and that hence it indicates that the prophets were not inspired, that Jesus Himself in the outset of His ministry contemplating such a Kingdom and finding it impossible to establish it, *changed His plan* which is indicative that He was not Divine, and that the Church, as founded and perpetuated, following the ministry of Jesus disproves the correctness of the Old Test. promises, etc. The advocates of the Church Kingdom idea, admit the change of form, declaring that those promises are not to be understood in their grammatical sense; that under this materialistic presentation of the Word, spiritual things are to be comprehended; that they are only the germ out of which spiritual conceptions develop, etc. The Rationalists—in such a onesided discussion by which Apologists strive to save inspiration, etc., in applying to the Church what any one can readily see does not now belong to it, and which cannot by any reasonable argument be made to correspond with covenant and prophetic announcements taken in their unity—have decidedly the vantage ground. Their appeal to the Jewish expectations, the early preaching corresponding to it, the faith of the primitive Church, etc., is *positively overwhelming* against such a line of defence. History, too, in all its phases sustains them in the position taken, and the development theory vainly set up as a bulwark against them is seized and pressed into their own service making Christianity itself only one phase of development. In the argument thus conducted, from a false premise, intellectually, historically, and logically, Rationalism has the decided advantage. Here, however, both parties take something for granted *wholly unproven*, and both overlook statements which plainly and unequivocally demonstrate *the error of the premise* from which their deductions are derived. The thing taken for granted is, that the Kingdom immediately followed the ministry of Jesus; the deduction made is, that being diverse from the one predicted by the grammatical sense, either a change was made in the Plan, or the predictions themselves must be interpreted in a sense to make them correspond with the changes introduced; the error of both is, that neither one nor the other pay *any attention* to the positive declarations of this same Jesus (after the representative men of the nation conspired to put Him to death) that, owing to the non-repentance of, and His rejection by, the nation, this identical Kingdom—the burden of prophecy, the subject of early preaching, the one bound in covenant relationship with the Jewish nation—is *postponed to a future period.* Having freely given the proofs relating to the postponement of the Kingdom (under Props. 56–75) it is not necessary to repeat them. Let us only ask, in the light of the various passages distinctively announcing it (and as held by the primitive Church), is it just for the Rationalist, when he comes to charge Jesus with wavering and finally changing His Plan, substituting something else for that which was predicted, to bring in such a serious and damaging impeachment *without allowing the accused the benefit of His own words and reasons* which fully

account for any changes that may temporarily intervene? Would such a line of reasoning deal rightfully with our fellow-men? On the other hand, we inquire of the Orthodox, how, as one who professes to accept of every portion of the Word, he *can totally ignore these passages* bearing on the subject as if they had no existence, and by this bring the faith of the early Church into contempt. We ask both, how it is possible for them not only *to pass by* the decided declarations of Jesus bearing upon this point, but even *to refuse credit* to the confirmatory evidence which Jesus gave to show that this postponement was a reality—evidence too continuously present with every generation from the days of Christ down to our own era. For, as has been shown in detail, it is in view of this very postponement of the Kingdom—the Jewish nation having shown itself unworthy to receive at that time the re-establishment of the Theocracy—that Jesus foretells the temporary rejection and overthrow of the nation, the down-treading of Jerusalem by the Gentiles during an allotted period, the calling of the Gentiles, a continued national unbelief during a determined time, the dispersed and yet preserved condition of the nation, the establishment of the Christian Church to secure a seed unto Abraham. Surely if desirous to allow Jesus the privilege *due to Him* of explaining the reasons *why* the Kingdom as covenanted, predicted, preached, and believed in by the pious was not set up, and *why* certain changes—such as we see—were introduced, then let its sincerity be exhibited in taking into deliberate consideration His own utterances upon the subject and the confirmatory proof that He has mercifully allowed to us. Since a delay of fulfilment, established by expressly foretelling it and by resultant existing facts, is no proof of a non-fulfilment, but rather indicative of the wonderful knowledge, power, and consistency of the Person through whom they are given, *it follows* that the changes, introduced for a time, instead of being *antagonistic* to the inspiration of the Word and the claims of Christ astonishingly *confirm* the same. The longer the postponement the more cumulative the evidence, seeing that eighteen centuries of continuous fulfilment of introduced change *only increases* the display of Christ's wonderful foreknowledge. The postponement thus presented by Jesus forms *the only true consistent answer* to many of the objections urged against the inspiration of the Bible, for instead of leading us to discard the obvious teachings of the Old Test., the preaching of the disciples and apostles, the faith of the churches, both Jewish and Gentile, just organized, and, above all, instead of placing Jesus in a false position of sending out disciples to preach what was not true, of holding out inducements which were vain, of professing that which He could not perform, of predicting that which can never be realized, and of shifting His plans to accommodate His own inability to give them success, it binds these together into a firm union, meets with a valid reason each point, and fairly vindicates the nature and character of the Messiah. These remarks need not to be extended, since various Propositions meet all the requirements of explanation demanded, and we may therefore conclude with the suggestion, that honest criticism will not forget how exceeding difficult it would be to eradicate or change the notion of the Kingdom entertained at the time of the First Advent by substituting another without at once entailing a fierce and widespread controversy between unbelieving and believing Jews; and which was evidently averted, as the early Church belief indicates, by the retention of the idea but postponing its realization to the period of the Sec. Advent.

The student is now prepared to notice what real worth there is in the deductions of Bauer drawn from his investigations of the Primitive Church. He undoubtedly is correct in many of his presented and proven facts, as e.g. that the early Church did firmly hold and teach a Messianic reign and Kingdom such as the pious Jews entertained, that they located this Kingdom at the Sec. Advent, etc. But Bauer, in his reasoning, carefully avoids two things, and these two are palpably *fatal* to his deductions and superstructure, viz., (1) that this is the very Kingdom covenanted and prophesied, and that, in simple consistency, ought to be held and preached by the primitive Church—that it is part of the Theocratic plan ; (2) that this Kingdom is postponed—that this postponement is expressly asserted and the reasons given for the same ; and may we add, (3) that the time is designated when it will come, and it has not yet been proven that Jesus Christ is inadequate to its re-establishment. Many things related to the future Kingdom evidence direct inspiration. Thus e.g. unbelief makes itself merry at the primitive belief of the nearness of the Advent. But let the reader refer to Prop. 74, Obs. 5, where the New Test. usage of such language is adduced, and he will find an indirect but most powerful proof of inspiration. Ignorant men could not have thus imitated the ideas of the Spirit, for they would have accommodated time to their own ideas of remoteness, whereas the Spirit—speaking in and through man—retains the self-same prophetic form presented in the Old Test., and continues to speak of time in *the largeness of view and realization* belonging to God, to whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

To indicate the wide field of proof in behalf of inspiration found in our argument, we briefly direct attention to the engrafting of the Gentiles. Notice the chain of circumstances, the union of which is beyond the power of "ignorant" fishermen, and men relying upon natural powers. (1) The Jewish nation an elect nation, Deut. 7 : 6 and 14 : 2, etc., being specially chosen to develop the Theocratic idea ; (2) this election indicated by the Theocracy ; (3) this Kingdom only tendered to the descendants of Abraham and engrafted Gentiles ; (4) after the Theocracy was withdrawn on account of sin, it was again offered, owing to the elect position of the nation, on condition of repentance by John, Jesus, and the disciples ; (5) the nation rejected the tender of the Kingdom by refusing to repent and must now bear its punishment, but still (Rom. 11 : 28, etc.) is the elect nation, i.e. the nation to whom, in view of its Theocratic relationship, the Kingdom pertains ; (6) now this election (confirmed by oath) must be maintained, but in view of the temporary rejection of the nation to suffer its punishment, a people—also elect—must be raised up to Abraham, perpetuating his seed ; (7) God could have done this miraculously (Matt. 3 : 9), but He purposes to do this on the principle of faith (as Abraham originally was received) and adoption ; (8) this people thus adopted, must be specially related to the Jewish commonwealth, i.e. so engrafted that it pertains to it ; (9) this is positively asserted as essential, e.g. Gal. 2, Eph. 2, etc. ; (10) because of the elect position of the Jewish nation, this engrafting could not be done without express divine revelation and direction, as given to Peter ; (11) the people thus engrafted, being a continuation of the elect, is designated such and the seed or children of Abraham ; (12) to these elect pertains the Kingdom in its highest form, viz., as inheritors—hence they are described as "heirs of the Kingdom ;" (13) when fully gathered out they inherit the Kingdom, when the elect nation, to whom pertains the Theocracy by covenant and prophecy, is again restored to God's favor. Now here is *a consecutive logical chain*, every link in it expressly given, presented by different minds at different times, foretold centuries before and fulfilled, opposed to Jewish prejudices and derogatory to the nation, objected to when the engrafting was inaugurated and yet received on the ground of direct divine interference and direction, showing throughout the unfolding of Divine Purpose. Human imposition could not possibly have developed *such a marvellous chain* of circumstances, utterly opposed to the national and individual prejudices of the Jewish mind. The solution for its existence must be found where the Scriptures place it.

Obs. 7. This doctrine of the Kingdom meets on higher ground the theories concerning inspiration. It frames a sufficient answer to the lower conceptions (referring it to genius) of Schleiermacher (*Der Ch. Glaube*), De Wette (*Lehrbuch*), Parker (*Dis. of Religion*), etc., and to the slightly advanced notions (making it the result of moral goodness) of Newman (*Essays*), Morell (*On Christianity*), Carlyle (*Works*), etc. It does not need to advocate the ideas of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Michaelis, etc., who ac-

knowledge only a part to be inspired, or of Twesten and many others who make it universal but unequal (from whence is derived the divisions of superintendence, elevation, direction, suggestion, etc.), or of that class who make all equally inspired. It does not even need a theory which serves to explain with scientific precision (good and great men differ) just *how far and in what degree* the Bible is inspired, for it derives its idea of inspiration not from this or that portion of the Book but from its contents *regarded as a whole*. It is the Divine Plan unfolded in it, and thus far most wonderfully carried out, that affords *the true and solid ground* for its inspiration. To illustrate by returning to our figure : the man who looks at a locomotive forms his conclusions respecting its design, adaptedness, etc., from its *completeness* as it stands before him, and does not detract from its inception, plan, design, use, etc., because the designer of it did not draft the exact shape of every rod, bolt, and screw employed in its construction. He judges the locomotive, its fitness, etc., by the mechanical principles exhibited in its make and to be specifically applied in its design. Reason influencing sound judgment, does not impel him to lay down the criterion that before he can accept of the conception of the builder, he must first be assured that every particular part of it is shaped and framed precisely as the inventor specified, for he knows that owing to the numerous workmen employed—men varying in skill—in its erection, some latitude and diversity must necessarily be allowed. He is abundantly satisfied with the consideration of the general outlines, if fashioned according to mechanics, and forms his judgment of the correctness of the inception, its greatness and value—not so much by the shape the material assumes but by *its capacity to perform* the work intended. Now let this principle of judgment, every day practically observed and enforced, be applied, in judging the inspiration of the Word. Let this doctrine of the Kingdom running from Genesis to Revelation (and which embraces the Divine Purpose) be duly considered, its initiatory form, its modification to bring it into closer relationship with humanity, its provisionary measures, etc., and it will be found at once that it contemplates a scheme *so noble* in conception, *so admirably* adapted to secure deliverance, *so extended* in its capacity to bring the much desired and wanted blessings to man, *so confirmed* by past and present fulfilments which form history, *so far beyond* anything that can be suggested by mere intelligence to remove existing evils, that *it commends itself* in design, adaptability and end contemplated as being of Divine origin. Much is said in some quarters of "the unlearned men" who have written the Old and New Test., so that in view of this mediumship, Steinbart and others (Fuller's *Calv. and Soc. comp.* Let. 12) assert, especially of the later writings : "These narrations, true or false, are only suited for ignorant, uncultivated minds, who cannot enter into the evidence of natural religion." Such sweeping declarations (shown to be improper by the higher class of Rationalistic minds eulogizing portions and acknowledging their influence upon the intelligence, civilization, morality, government, etc., of nations)[1] only afford us additional ground for defence. If it were impossible for unskilful, ignorant workmen to build a locomotive with its complicated application of mechanical principles and its confinement and allotment of a powerful force in nature (which in the very nature of the case requires, and is indicative of, intelligent comprehension) *how much less* is it possible for "ignorant" men to construct, develop, and exhibit *such a Theocratic Plan* as is embraced in the doctrine of this King-

dom ; a Plan running through thousands of years, requiring the most extraordinary manifestations and provisions, incorporating an animating, pervading unity extending from the entailment of the curse to its removal, from the loss of a Paradise to its final restoration, from a withdrawal of God to His dwelling again with man, from the introduction of evil to its complete overthrow, from a Redemption needed to a Redemption fully gained. Is it just to discard inspiration without first allowing reason, *rising above mere prejudice*, to ponder the astonishing *historical* (evidenced by continuous historical fulfilment) *and doctrinal* (shown by the perfect agreement of all the writers) *unity* in the matter of this Kingdom. It professes to be the Kingdom of God, and to judge correctly whether it comes from God we must not merely confine ourselves to the manner in which it is presented (the mediumship) but observe whether it is *worthy* of God and *conducive* to the highest interests of humanity, and the answer to this becomes the leading proof of inspiration. The evolving of *a continuous, unintermitted unity of Purpose* (notwithstanding the hindrances presented by human nature) ; the distinctive preservation of the same decided outline of belief *from beginning to end* through writers separated by ages ; the acknowledgments of the writers themselves that in certain stages of the developing of the Plan they themselves were *involved in unbelief* not then being able to see the connection ; *the extraordinary simplicity* of the manner in which the matters pertaining to the Kingdom are recorded, the remarkable *adaptation* consisting between the Plan, and the condition (need) of man, and the end (desirable) intended—these and other considerations inspire *such confidence* in its representations (confirmed as they are by personal observation in present fulfilments and present experience in the reception of the Word) that the alleged discrepancies and difficulties (if even unsusceptible of explanation or reconciliation) give place to a firm belief in its divine inspiration. The very appeal to the Supernatural is found to be reasonable from the necessary connection it sustains not only to the deliverance of man—to which nature contributes nothing satisfactory and for which intelligence can substitute nothing better—and to the carrying out of the Plan, but in the proposal of the method itself, of the means by which it is to be accomplished, and of the great Agent through whom it is to be performed. If it is a Divine Plan at all it must be judged by *the Divinity* that it contains, illustrates, and enforces—not by its being drafted on paper, or given through the lips and pens of men, but by its design as a whole, its practical results, etc. Without now insisting upon the moral preparation requisite (and so important as the Bible justly states) to receive the truth as given ; without pressing an answer to the question whether knowledge and faith are necessarily conjoined ; without urging the existence of a moral nature which responds through its capacities to truth adapted to man's own good ; without showing that natural religion affords but a reflected light and that very dim ; without insisting that humanity in every successive generation comes upon the stage of life in the same way, commencing its culture, etc., from the same point, exhibiting its utter inability in the same earthly fate from the greatest to the lowest, to remove the evils incident to this world—Reason—when speaking as reason, God-given, should speak—says that the evidence of truth is not so much in the manner, style, etc., in which it is given as *in the truth itself*, i.e., in its contents, its ideas, its statements, etc. ; and that the highest possible evidence is that when the truth, thus stripped of its appendages

(which may even serve to weaken it), *commends itself by virtue of that which it contains, and by its perfect agreement with a related, consistent Plan.* To prove, therefore, an inconsistency, a lack of inspiration in the Word of God, there must not be that low form of criticism which seizes upon the vehicle (acknowledged by God to be a weak instrumentality) through which the truth is presented, and picks out a flaw here and there, but there must be a direct showing either that the whole Plan is defective, or that this or that portion is utterly unsuited to carry out the purpose designed. Hence the assaults made upon the books of Moses are one-sided uncritical, and unjust to the Bible, simply because in the attack *the relationship* that these books sustain to an entire system of truth—to a Divine Plan—is totally ignored. Dealing with Moses honorably and justly, requires an investigation of the Divine Plan which he alleges God gave to him to reveal. If it can be shown that the Plan is not adapted to secure the end intended, that it cannot give the deliverance and happiness which it proposes, *then*, of course, an argument that appeals to sound reason is made out. But on the other hand, so long as the heart, the vital part, is untouched—the great leading truth stands uncontradicted—then the refutation of destructive criticism is found in the books themselves. The inspiration of the books of Moses is shown not by this or that statement, but by their design as a whole and their relationship to the rest of the Word; and to effectively invalidate it, men must show that the design contemplated, partly become history, is unworthy of God, defective in adaption, and sustains no relation to the final result proposed. The honest conviction of the writer, expressed with feelings of regard toward those who think and write differently, is that the truthfulness of those books evidenced in the therein predicted temporary (though long-continued) overthrow of the Theocracy, the dispersion and down-trodden condition of the Jewish nation, the Gentile dominancy, the calling of the Gentiles, the preservation of the nation, etc., and *now witnessed by us* in the world's history, *outweighs all the objections* (hypothetical at best) which have been urged against them. Living, direct *present testimony* is vastly to be preferred to mere deductions when credibility is the issue; and when we see before us, as at this day, the continued fulfilment going on, it is unreasonable to leave *the real* for the merely suggestive, *the demonstrated* for the unproven. For Deut. ch. 32 *alone* is amply sufficient, if studied in the light of the past and present, to refute the efforts to cast discredit upon these books. Beholding thus the intimate and necessary union existing between all the books even the earliest and the latest—every one bearing its testimony to the same Plan—it is with a feeling of sadness that we find such a writer as Parker (*Dis. of Religion*), uttering the view of a growing class: "Here (in the Bible) are the works of various writers, thrown capriciously together and united *by no common tie* but the lids of the bookbinder." The wish is evidently the father to the expressed thought, and as the heart desired it so reason adopted it. We have too much respect for the reasoning capacity of Parker to believe that he could pen such a sentence in defiance of existing facts, without a controlling motive that biassed reason. It only indicates what has been all along urged, that our opponents do not fairly meet the writers of the Bible on their own ground. If there is no bond of union—such as the doctrine of the Kingdom presents—it can be shown and proven not to exist, but no one has yet attempted this hopeless task, giving us in place of it mere assertion. The insincerity of the latter

is emphatically seen by the notorious fact that one of the leading objections of a multitude of the Parker school is exactly the reverse of this, viz., that such a union does exist between them, but being based on the same common reception and promulgation of "Jewish conceptions" is on this ground to be discarded. Numerous writers reject the New Test. books because a continuation and confirmation of the Jewish ideas of the Old. Both objections, however, are not based on unprejudiced reasoning, for the simple reason that neither of them regards the continuity of Purpose or the remarkable features of the Plan which men, separated by many centuries, under varied circumstances, of prosperity and adversity, freedom and captivity, ignorant and learned, subjects and kings, reveal in a direct series of announcements, forming *one connected design* which they assert Divine Providence will ultimately carry out; and as collateral evidence, independent of that higher which the Plan itself affords, they point to past and present fulfilments to prove that the design is in progress toward completion. Let manliness in the attack then meet the claim of inspiration right here, in the Plan of this Book given for Redemptive purposes, showing its unadaptedness to produce the contemplated result, and in the alleged confirmatory proof, manifesting the absence of fulfilment. Many portions of the Scriptures, such an Daniel, parts of Isaiah, the Apocalypse, etc., are viewed *isolated* from the Plan and the relation that they sustain to it. In reference to Daniel recent writers, like Arnold, etc., reviving the old objection of Celsus, discard him because so largely and astonishingly verified by history, alleging that the fulfilment shows that his prophecies must have been written after the events, professedly predicted, had taken place. This blow aimed at the nature and integrity of prophecy as contained in the Old Test., and *indorsed by Jesus and the apostles, utterly fails* for two reasons; one is, that it ignores the distinctive position that Daniel occupies in reference to the development of the Plan, not only accurately coinciding with what was previously given, but adding necessary details which accurately fit into and materially aid (as we have seen) in filling out the Divine Purpose; another is, that Daniel to-day is (as we have shown) still in continuous fulfilment, so that his veracity as a receiver of Divine truth, is evidenced in Gentile rule, in the dispersion of his nation, in the history of the Church, in the postponement of the Kingdom, etc. The doctrine of the Kingdom gives this prophet such irresistible force, unity of design, continuity of purpose, etc., that no attack can be *logically successful* unless it meets this distinctive phase of his writings.[2] Ignoring this relationship, pre-eminently worthy of notice on account of its being the strongest proof of inspiration, we find some (as e.g. Parker, *Abs. Relig.*, p. 205) declare that the "writings of the prophets contain nothing above the reach of the human faculties," and that "the mark of human infirmity is on them all and proofs or signs of miraculous inspiration," so that it is maintained (as e.g. Foxton in *Pop. Christianity*, quoted by Fairbairn *On Proph.*, p. 97), "that there are no proper predictions of the future in the Scriptures, and that there cannot be." The last clause reveals the spirit of judgment applied by many to the Bible, for coming to it with a prejudged decision respecting its contents, and what it cannot contain—it is easy work to discard its teachings. But this is not weighing the main evidence upon which the Book relies, viz., its Divine Plan; it is not even considering the subsidiary proof of prophecy which receives its force and propriety owing to its relationship to this Plan. If such persons could be induced to study,

impartially, the Bible as they do science, art, literature, etc., would not the leading questions be, what is the Divine Purpose professedly given in it, and what is its adaptation to the necessities of man and the world, and what is the proof that the purposed Plan in itself, as well as in its appendages, gives in its favor. Let the Kingdom in which the Plan of God culminates be considered in the scriptural light given under previous Propositions (thus even confirming the position of Rationalism itself that the Kingdom as predicted is not now visible), in its covenanted form, in its manifestation, in its overthrow or withdrawal, in its being tendered conditionally, in its rejection, in its being held in abeyance, and, above all, in its design, suitable adjustment to the needs of man and society, etc.—let attention be directed to the manner of prediction which is not that of man, owing to the Jewish spirit naturally being opposed to the calling of the Gentiles, the disparagement of their own nation, the recording of their own sinfulness and humiliation, the postponement of the Kingdom through their own guilt, and rejection, etc.—let it be pondered when these predictions relating to the Kingdom were given, when the Kingdom was established (and still its withdrawal foretold), when overthrown and in ruins, when the nation was down-trodden by the most powerful empires, and when its postponement during the times of the Gentiles was fully announced ; let the provisionary measures (previously announced as part of the Plan) be contemplated, such as the Coming of One in the line of David and the portraiture of Him precisely meeting the required conditions of covenant and promise, the intercallary period introduced confirmed by the call and gathering of the Gentiles, the condition of the Jews, the unbelief of Jews and Gentiles, etc., let all this (and more as suggested by works specially devoted to giving evidences for we are now only concerned with those pertaining to the Kingdom), be regarded, and the Kingdom itself, with the vast and complicated (yet consistent unity exhibited) series of development necessary for its establishment—with the perfecting of its King and rulers through trial and suffering—with the merciful preliminary preparations—with its most loving union with and exaltation of humanity—with its beginning, progress, incorporation of David's Son, teaching, prediction, promise, intercallary period and final re-establishment blended together into one harmonious whole—with the Supernatural necessarily connected with it in its conception, organization, provisions, and reconstitution, and all this gives reasonable and conclusive evidence of its divine origin—of its being indispensable to the natural in order to lift it up out of the evils which now so fatally encompass it. The charges of "a cunningly devised fable," of "mythical" accounts, of "legendary" mixture, and of "intentional fiction," come from those who persistently refuse to study the utterances of the several writers of the Bible in the relation that they sustain to the Divine Purpose in its beginning, progress, and, especially, in its goal—the ultimate end designed.

[1] One of the strangest peculiarities of unbelief is this : that, rising above the old hatred which totally ignored any worthiness in Jesus, men like Renan, Mill, etc., should eulogize the sayings, life, and character of Christ, while denying His claims upon them as recorded. The religious confession of Mill may well be reproduced illustrating this feature. When acknowledging a historical Christ, he adds : "But who among His disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? Certainly not the fishermen of Galilee ; as certainly not St. Paul, whose character and idiosyncrasies were of a totally different sort ; still less the early Christian writers in whom is nothing more evi-

dent than that the good which was in them was all derived, as they always professed that it was derived, from the higher source." (Quoted *Lit. Liv. Age*, taken from the *Spectator*, vol. 123, p. 511.) But such concessions are afterward crushed under an array of doubt respecting Christ's own belief, etc., and not the slightest attempt is made to view Christ *in His Theocratic relationship*. Then, on the other hand, we are saddened at the eagerness with which intelligent men find fault with almost everything pertaining to Christianity. Thus e.g. Draper referring to Luther's opposition to the Aristotelian philosophy and to the school men (and, by the way, conveniently overlooking the fact that the dark ages were mainly introduced through their influence), asserts: "So far as science is concerned, *nothing* is owed to the Reformation." How he, against the testimony of history (Mosheim, Neander, Kurtz, Millman, etc.), could say "*nothing*" we cannot comprehend, when under its fostering influence learning was revived, schools and universities established, chairs of philosophy and science were instituted, books and periodicals published, literature and art were encouraged, and many sons of the Church became able and noted scientists. Of course such writers as Jacobson, Ingersoll, Bennett, Coleman, Syphers, and many others, can find but *very little* either in the Bible or in Christianity to commend.

[2] There is a most astounding correspondence between prophecy and fulfilment not expressed, but which the student finds by due consideration of the two. Thus e.g. Daniel (and so the other prophets) so frames his predictions, that in the fulfilment no discrepancy or antagonism shall appear. Delineating the history of world empires (as in ch. 7) he passes by (excepting one instance) the First Advent of Jesus and brings us down to the Sec. Advent, the Coming in the clouds of heaven. Why this omission of the First Advent? The reason, as the past teaches, is found in the simple fact that the Spirit influencing the prophet foreknew the tender of the Kingdom, its rejection, and its final postponement to the Sec. Advent, so that the framework of the prediction in this single particular is based *on a foreknown knowledge* of the non-setting up of the Kingdom (as we have proven) at the First Advent and its postponement to the Sec. Coming. Daniel describes not only the course of empires, the continued down-trodden condition of the people of God, the position of things as we see them to-day, but (as the design was to contrast empires or a world-dominion) he omits that which, if mentioned, would be misleading—thus bringing his predictions *into wonderful unity* with historical facts, and displaying *an amazing knowledge* of the future which is only implied in connection with that which is expressed.

Obs. 8. In this connection it may be expected that something more directly should be said concerning the first chapters of Genesis. Without calling into question the sincerity and honest[1] intentions of many eminent scientists who hold that these chapters are opposed to the deductions of science, as given by them, it is sufficient to show that they do not even approach these chapters, much less interpret them, in the spirit of a correct scientific research and study. We are not concerned in this discussion, valuable as they may be, with the theories of friends which strive to reconcile these chapters with science, or with the fatal concessions of opponents (such as to account for the first organisms, feeling, instinct, intelligence, morality) which evince that many of their statements are merely hypothetical. The explanations on the one hand and the conjectures on the other, are, in our estimation, superseded by an argument in favor of their divine origin, which cannot be, or at least has not been, controverted. Instead of taking up these chapters isolated, given with the utmost conciseness and in the most cautious language to adapt them to unscientific as well as learned minds, with the idea that they are designed to teach with precision (making no allowance for figure and none for the lapse of time that may be denoted either in the first or second verse or in succeeding ones)[2] the scientific notions underlying the creation, we must receive them with the benefit and interpretation accruing to them by *the relationship* they sustain to the rest of the Bible. The student will observe that the more particular, detailed history of the world rightly begins with the history of Abraham (which

alone occupies far more space than the whole antediluvian period) owing to its important covenanted relationship. What precedes is found in a remarkably compressed summary of events without the least attempt at explanation, or the imparting of details, and thus forms a mere introduction—given to preserve consistency—to that which follows. Now how can the brief introduction—the subject of special dispute—be verified as truthful and hence reliable? Evidently by *the body that follows*, for in the first chapters we have a description of events, which, in the very nature of the case, it is utterly impossible for man now to verify, or to deny, excepting solely through inferences. Being only introductory to a Divine Revelation, the Divinity of the Revelation is to be inferred and proven by *what follows*, thus incorporating the introduction itself. If there has been such a creation, such a fall, such a withdrawal of God, such an expulsion from Paradise, such a curse of sorrow, trial and death imposed, such a burdening of Creation, then surely in the Plan which is built upon the central idea of a recovery from evil and a restoration of forfeited blessings there should be found the evidence of the reality of this introduction, making the Plan itself a necessity. This is the method taken by the scientist in tracing his own doctrine of evolution, taking the present, what he sees, and *going back* into past ages.[3] Let us take what we see and know, and thus go back to Genesis, and we will find its statements substantiated by *a connected chain of evidence*, before which all purely inferential statements must vanish. Thus we see man fallen, i.e. naturally given to evil; God personally withdrawn; no Paradise; Creation with all its retained blessings burdened with evil; the creature man oppressed with sorrow and death; and with all this a self-consciousness impressed—arising out of our moral nature—of dependence upon a Higher Being, of relationship to an extra-mundane Will, and even of accountability to a Moral Governor. The condition in which we are placed is thus far confirmatory of Genesis, but to stop here would be to overlook the main proof still remaining. Upon these statements is based *a Plan* to recover man and nature from the evils entailed and, at least, experienced. Now, in common justice, the Plan itself with its accompanying evidences ought to be duly studied before deciding adverse to the Book. The Plan involves "*restitution*" through the mediumship of a divinely instituted Theocratic arrangement, which embraces in its Head, Jesus the Christ, the union of the divine with the human, thus restoring the presence of God, bridging over the chasm now existing between the world and God, and bringing to man in all his relations the deliverance that he needs. This restitution is intelligently evolved in the election of an individual, family and nation, in the establishment of a Theocracy, in the incorporation of a throne and Kingdom, in wonderful preparatory measures to secure the end aimed at, and all this substantiated by historical facts in the past, and existing before our eyes at the present day. Restitution comes to us in Genesis, is found in every book of the Old Test., is taught in the Gospels and Epistles, stands forth most vividly and grandly in the last communication, and forms *the Key-note* of covenant, prophecy and promise. Thus it proclaims *a unity* existing between the first chapters of Genesis and all the after books down to the latest, which in itself *vindicates* the narrative of Creation and the fall of man; and when we closely examine the ultimate end (having first noticed the provision made for it, and the Agent through whom it is to be affected), and see how wonderfully this promised restoration meets what Genesis proclaims forfeited through sin, it would be sheer

presumption *to yield up the truthfulness* of a record attested to by the multitude of events relating to Redemption which have transpired, sealed by the Coming and glorious acts of the Messiah, and vindicated by the movements of Providence in the history of nations and of the Church. The God who appears in Creation, who manifests His love for man and then His displeasure at sin, again appears in love and mercy, manifested by the most extraordinary admirably adapted measures of grace looking forward to a magnificent re-creation, and thus stamps the first record as divine. Facts, a thousand of them, are in their unison evidence of the truth of that which occurred before man existed, even if we are unable to give all the details which science may demand. If the Bible professed not to teach science ; if it did not adopt, in order to be understood, the popular method of speaking ; if it did not encourage the prosecution of scientific knowledge ; if it did not urge us to study the works of Creation ; then, indeed, it might be objected that in its simple devotion to its grand conception of Redemption, it either professed too much or too little, but taken up as it is with the development of a world's recovery it still gives, without scientific detail or annunciation, the material for science to labor with, and in friendly tones invites her to exertions. In Genesis, as explained and enforced by the tenor of the entire Word, we have *a personal God* presented who takes a deep and abiding interest in the welfare of man, not only filling out a proper conception of the absolute, but bringing Him into intimate relationship with this world. We have evolution proceeding from Infinite Intelligence, according with Divine Purpose, manifesting a Divine Plan, previously entertained and now carried out. This is eminently more satisfactory than that reasoning which removes this personal Creator and introduces matter and force as the original producers of life, making *a self-creative* matter and force (although some writers on both sides advocate an intelligent cause directing this evolution), out of which, in some way *unexplained*, the first organisms are self-developed.[4] We are gravely told that Creation is, because evolution is a necessity or a law originating all things ; or, that all things have existed from eternity and will continue to exist under fixed, unchangeable law (thus making evil itself eternal) ; or that Creation is a manifestation of Deity and is God in process of development, etc. Even the dignity of man so carefully preserved in the Word, is lowered by many into a self-emancipation from the condition of an ape, or even lower creature.[5] Such are the theories, destructive alike to God's claims on man and man's moral obligations to God, which are presented to satisfy the cravings after knowledge and to indicate the true position of man in this world. From such hypothesis, unsuited to impart accurate knowledge of the origin of things, and unadapted to remove the evils of this world, we turn with relief to that Divine Plan of Redemption, which, by the abundant and glorious provision made for our Salvation through *the Theocratic King Jesus the Christ* seals the account of Creation, the origin of man, etc., with the marks of divine recognition and approval, thus elevating both nature and man ; making the former the means through which His attributes are exhibited, and the latter through whom they may be recognized and glorified. The doctrine of the Kingdom, which embraces God's Purpose in its inception, progress and final result insures *the accuracy* of the Mosaic record, and hence the reliability of the biblical history of man. Just so soon as the author of *Ecce Homo* can foretell what Moses so accurately did thousands of years before the events came to pass

—as at this day—*then* we will be prepared, and *not before*, to accept of his eulogy of the votaries of science when he makes (p. 353) " the least among them greater than Moses." But even such evidence, great as it is, gives place to a far greater, viz., the development through Moses of God's *Theocratic order*, and the subsequent, continued prosecution of the Plan in the provision made for it, enforcing and explaining the personal God, the relation of the world and man to Him, etc. Hence we repeat, that amid the mighty and unceasing changes of nations and kingdoms, amid the unnumbered actions of the vast crowd of successive agents, amid the constantly arising contingencies and opposition, the Plan, given in those books, having been *steadily progressing toward the goal*, Moses needs *no better vindication* than this affords. The covenant, the Theocracy, the temporary withdrawal of the same, the rejection of the Jewish nation, their tribulation and scattered and yet preserved condition, the engrafting of the Gentiles, etc., these speak in louder and more convincing tones to the wise and prudent than either the scientists, or Colenso, and their abettors, building upon mere deduction or hypothesis[6] leading to Materialism, Naturalism, Pantheism, Emanation, and even Optimism, ending again in Pessimism and Nihilism. The happy combining of the moral and religious with the physical by Moses places him at once, aside from other considerations, immensely in advance of those who—against the complex constitution of man—are striving to bring out all truth from the same natural source ; or, if admitting a diversity, make the lower, i.e. the physical, the criterion by which to measure the higher, i.e. the spiritual. If difficulties occur to the investigator or interpreter, which, in the light of the connection with a living organized Plan following, unmistakably proven by its historical and doctrinal unity, is the most reasonable ; to jump to the conclusion that all is false, or patiently to wait for a reconciliation or interpretation that science or theology has so often opportunely and unexpectedly given ; especially when many of the most eminent of scientists in the past and a goodly number now find no difficulty in maintaining, on such grounds, the attitude of true believers in the Word. Prof. Christlieb in his brief admirable essay (counteracting Mod. Infidelity), after giving some illustrations of reconcilations affected by enlarged science, justly observes, " We begin to see proof positive for Cuvier's far-seeing utterance, ' Moses has left us a cosmogony, the exactitude of which is confirmed day by day in an admirable manner.' "[7] Yes, and it is reconfirmed by the very opposition made against it, for the same Word which gave the cosmogony has assured us that men would arise who (e.g. 2 Pet. 3 : 6) would profess faith in the perpetuity of things, as they now exist, in endless succession—would deny the record of Moses, and the relation that Creation sustained to the power and designs of God. With the evidence that we now have, we can hopefully and trustingly await for that brighter, most glorious corroboration of Moses, when the Theocratic Ruler shall exert His re-creative power over the same Creation, His resurrecting power over the same race, and re-introduce the original purpose and blessing of Creation in that Sabbath, into which man could not then enter because of sin, in which God is All and in all, and which the self-consciousness and experience of man, even now asserting itself against theories degrading to his moral, intellectual, and religious worth and dignity, will ever exult in the beneficence and love of *an intelligent present Creator and Redeemer*. And honesty compels us to add : when the distinction between

the righteous and the wicked will be made manifest, in virtue of that very Creation (now ridiculed) which alone could bestow a moral nature conscious of good and evil—to which the Bible from Genesis to Revelation so affectionately appeals—and which binds us, willing or unwilling, with unalterable firmness—attested to by the moral sense—securely to the scrutiny and judgment of an Almighty Moral Governor who bestows the moral as well as the natural. Conscientious and learned opponents are reminded, that the creation of man as given by Moses, in the manner indicated and with the moral superadded to the natural—thus distinguishing him from the beasts—in the very nature of the case prepares the way for the after continued proclamation of man's accountability, of man's being under moral law, of man's moral needs, and of man's elevation or degradation in proportion to his acknowledgments of moral obligations and acceptance of the provisions made for his moral nature. Thus in fact the first chapters of Genesis form a basis for all future Revelation, and the one cannot be adjusted with precision without a constant reference to the other, while the very construction of man himself physical and moral responds—if the whole truth is allowed free access to mind and heart—to the correctness of the portraiture drawn. The chasm between the origin of matter and the results, the natural and the moral, the material and the spiritual, is *an impassible gulf* unless we receive the explanation vouchsafed by Revelation, thus vindicating its inspiration. Besides this, the heart felt reception of succeeding Revelation, its influence and practical workings in heart and life, its adaptation to all our necessities, etc., this, as the Word invites us to experience, most conclusively and powerfully contributes to the proving of its Supernatural origin.[8] While acknowledging that reason should weigh even probabilities, yet its chief concern is with facts, not simply as they appear in a concisely written record, but as they spring legitimately developed therefrom ; and consistency demands that all these must be regarded before reason can logically decide in the matter. Hence believing that many of our opponents are actuated, in presenting their objections, by respect for and love of the truth, we direct their attention to the method by which alone *the whole truth* can be attained. In this way science and philosophy which have demonstrated and argued so much that is valuable and in accord with the principles of the Divine Word, will find no antagonism to hinder research, no unfriendliness to effort, but much to aid and sustain after the search of truth, bringing in and enforcing from Creation to a re-Creation a divine order of procedure, which bends to its purpose conflicting powers and overcomes evil in necessary preparatory stages of progress and development.[9]

[1] Certainly without injustice we may make several exceptions to this when we find language employed which indicates positive hatred toward the Bible. To illustrate : when in the very title-page of books a low enmity to the Scriptures is evidenced as in Darwin quoting (in Introd. to *Descent of Man*) a work published by Dr. Barrago Francesco, entitled, "Man, made in the image of God, was *also made* in the image of the ape." There is just reason to suspect that the real aim of some is by any means, either by destructive criticism, or by deductions of natural science, or by the aid of philosophy, to get rid of Supernatural agencies owing to *dislike* to the Word. We are to receive, unquestioning, alleged facts, when no proof is presented of new species starting into existence, of no process of development going on in imperfect formations, of no prolongation of species from individuals raised up by crossing, of no breaking down of the limits assigned in nature between species, of no intermediate formations and changes in geological strata, etc. Fallacious reasoning, with numerous chasms, is to be our guide, bringing no ray of hope to man of ultimate redemption. Strange cisterns from which to draw water !

[2] As e.g. Delitzsch, Kurtz, Buckland, Pratt, Chalmers, Sedgewick, Birks, etc., on the first part, and Hugh Miller, McCausland, Macdonald, Guyot, etc., on the latter portion. The defenders of the Mosaic record are numerous, including such names as Auberlen, Keil, Lange, Zollman, Wagner, Ampere, De Serres, Burmeister, Fabri, Cuvier, Hitchcock, Dana, J Pye Smith, Jacobus, Tayler Lewis, Blumenbach, Ebrard, Shubert, Karl von Raumer, John Müller, Alex. von Humboldt, Gray, Owen, Dawson, Winchell, Agassiz, Jevons, Thompson, Lotze, Beale, Hemholtz, Wundt, Prof. Mivart, Prof. Henry, Bowen. The only fatal objections that can be of force against the Bible account of creation would be to prove that the world is eternal or self-created, or that man was not preceded by other creations, or that man did not precede woman, etc. That is, prove something directly in antagonism with the record. Until this is done we would rather contemplate the Paradise of the Bible than Strauss's "Chaldaic primeval slime," or the scientist's "aboriginal wilds of man's progenitor, the ape;" we would rather take the biblical account of man and the destiny offered to him than the gross materialism of Voght which makes thought merely "a secretion of the brain," and of Moleschott, which destines him for "manure for the ground."

[3] This process of reasoning is rejected, however, by them when it can be favorably urged in behalf of the Scriptures; they also, in the most deliberate manner, reject, without consideration, the various attempts made at reconciliation in this manner as witnessed e.g. in Froude and Huxley (as quoted in *Scribner's Monthly*, March, 1873), who coolly ignore such labors (worthy of attention, in view of the interests at stake), and exalt the doctrine of evolution, as taught by them, above the Bible, and who, with *the bigotry* that they profess to despise, advise the rejection of "all theologies" based on the Scriptures and the reception of scientific results. Lest we be charged with injustice, let Huxley himself speak: "All theologies which are based on the assumption of the truth of the account of the origin of things given in the Book of Genesis, being utterly irreconcilable with the doctrine of evolution, the student of science who is satisfied that the evidence upon which the doctrine of evolution rests is incomparably stronger and better than that upon which *the supposed* authority of the Book of Genesis rests, *will not trouble himself further* with these theologies, but will confine his attention to such arguments against the view that he holds as are based upon purely scientific data." This, indeed, would be a narrowing the field of controversy to accommodate an enemy: the moral, the religious, the spiritual, the theological, is to give place to pure material science; *the higher* is to bow to *the lower*. The proposition surely did not originate in a scientific mind, but in *a prejudiced* heart, seeing that it asks what only a limited, unscientific mind, under the influence of bigotry or one-sidedness could suggest, viz., the forsaking of a vantage field higher than the mere plane of nature, in order to accommodate the hostility of others. The advice, perhaps, is given to protect its own weakness, for truth seeks no concealment and is equally at home on every contested field.

[4] We scarcely need to guard our argument by saying that in this process of reasoning we take for granted the universal experience of man, viz., that we only can know the intelligence, the purpose, etc., of our fellow-men by their language, works, actions, not by actual possession or tangible use in ourselves of that intelligence belonging exclusively to them, but by facts produced through that intelligence, and which intelligence, even lower in ourselves, appreciates when once given. This we apply in considering the intelligent plan of the Creator—an intelligence existing outside of us, yet which, when established by facts, appeals to reason and can be comprehended as reasonable by the intelligence within us. Indeed, we may safely add—which cannot be rejected without doing violence to intelligence.

[5] So Boucher, de Perthes, Lyell, Lubbock, Darwin, Rolle, Huxley, Wallace, Vogt, Häckel, Carpenter, etc., admitting, however, that there is a missing link, which Büchner, with childlike faith, expects yet to be found in Australia or New Zealand! The *faith* of these writers is a lesson to us unbelievers, and their *humility* is most expressive. The latter is given by Fry (quoted by Carpenter, *Contemp. Review*, 1872, in art. "On Mind and Will in Nature") when he remarks: "This dislike to acknowledge a relationship with the lower animals is not an expression of the *truest Christian feeling*, but is opposed to it." But how a Christian can ignore the Bible testimony and yet remain a Christian with "the truest Christian feeling" both Fry and Carpenter fail to tell us.

[6] That we justly characterize it thus is apparent (1) from the concessions of scientists; (2) from the conflicting views entertained by them, no two of eminence exactly corresponding; (3) from the results flowing from their views, verging now to materialism, then to Pantheism, then to extreme Pessimism (the latter latest phase exemplified e.g. in Von Hartman's *Philosophy of the Unconscious*), etc.; (4) from the sharp criticisms passing

between them (e.g. Page's remarks on Darwin's theory in Owen's *Debat. Land*, p. 262); (5) from the statements found e.g. in such works as Lamark's *Man from Oysters*, Virey's *True Brotherhood between the Baboon and Hottentot*, Vincent's *Fifteen Original Species of Man*, Maillet's *Parrots from Perch*, Oken's *God is Rotary Motion*, and similar ones. See some of the assumptions shown by Elam in *Eclectic Mag.*, Dec., 1876, by Martineau in his criticisms of evolution in *Contemp. Review*, 1876., etc.

[7] The student can advantageously consult in vindication of the credibility of Moses the writings of G. S. Faber, Bryant, Maurice, Sir W. Jones, Horne, Jahn, Hævernick, Lisco, Wolf, Turner, Wordsworth, Murphy, Jacobus, etc. The scientific objections are more specially noticed by Zöchler (*Bremen Lec.* and his *His. of Creation*), the Duke of Argyle (*Recent Speculations on Primeval Man*), Burmeister (*His. Creation*), Stutz (*The His. of Creation According to Geology and the Bible*), Sumner (*Records of Creation*), Lewis (*Six Days of Creation* and his special Introd. to Lange's *Com. Genesis*, Amer. Ed.), Birk (*On the Creation*), Pattison (*The Earth and the Word*), Wiseman (*Lects.*), etc. Both combined are found presented in able works, such as Ulrici's *God in Nature*, Hartwig's *God in Nature*, Wagner's writings, Kurtz's *Bible and Astronomy*, and the writings of Delitzsch, Keil, Hofman, Hengstenberg, Baumgarten, Sumner, Hancock, Green, Lord, etc. While for the defence of the Supernatural, including the Mosaic record, such writings as the following are interesting and valuable: Rogers's *Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, Liddon's *Elements of Religion*, Griffith's *Fundamentals, or Basis of Belief Concerning Man, God, etc.*, Frazer's *Blending Lights*, Heer's *Har. of Creation*, Ebrard's *Faith in Holy Writ*, Warring's *Mosaic Creation and Modern Science* (*Scribner's Monthly*, vol. 15), and numerous others of a similar nature. The student will not pass by Birk's *Modern Physical Fatalism and the Doctrine of Evolution*, Gladstone's *Points of Supposed Collision Between Scripture and Natural Science*, and others.

[8] To this the rejoinder may be made, that the profession of multitudes evinces but little or none of the Christian life as portrayed in the Word. To this the reply is ready, that this, too, accurately accords with the statements of Christ that "*many*" shall profess, but that "*few*" shall be truly righteous. The very "mixed" condition of the Church with the sad fruits, is only evidence of the truthfulness of the Word, which full describes it and warns us in view of it to be the more guarded. The past history of the Church, however it may prove a disgraceful commentary on man's depraved nature, and a showing forth of God's forbearance, is also one which exhibits the experience of God's mercy, love, and promises in Christ Jesus. The mere profession of Christianity as witnessed in the past undoubtedly had its influence upon J. S. Mill, when he takes the following ground in his *Utility of Religion*, saying: "Belief, then, in the Supernatural, great as are the services which it rendered in the early stages of human development, cannot be considered to be any longer required, either for enabling us to know what is right or wrong in social morality, or for supplying us with motives to do right and to abstain from wrong." But, unfortunately for this reasoning, those who cast aside the Supernatural in Revelation as an infallible moral guide—the basis of moral law and the supplier of motives—are utterly unable to decide respecting the right and wrong or the motives; they differing widely among themselves and forming direct antagonisms, while all who receive the Word, even they whose lives do not correspond with its requirements, acknowledge the binding force of Revelation.

[9] From the standpoint occupied by us, we are not specially concerned in the various efforts made to show that the declarations of Moses accord with the deductions of science. And yet it is a matter of congratulation that *so much of accurate accord* exists between them. If we refer to the recent articles on "Cosmology" in Relig. Cyclopædias, Bib. Dictionaries, Introductions to the Bible, etc., we find a sufficiency, not only in the outlines, but even in the details to indicate that *no conflict* need exist between science and the Bible. It has been remarked (which unbelief is loath to confess) that the Biblical account of Creation "deviates far less from the conclusions approximatively reached by the most careful deductions of geology, than any other ancient cosmogony" (Gladstone's Lect. on *Faith and Free Thought*, p. 165). Why not admit this? Simply because it would be praise given the Bible, which, to write the truth, is despised or hated. If the Bible says that the world was "without form," "void," in "darkness" in "mist," so also does science. If it teaches that "light" came before the sun appeared, that a division was made between the waters and land, that then organic life commenced its forms, that the creation of forms commenced with the lower and in respective steps ascended to a higher, that man was the latest and highest development, so does science. *Why not* then frankly admit such a remarkable agreement? Why e.g. does Huxley (*The Three Hypotheses of the His. of Nature*) when he frankly acknowledges that his own theory has

no "*testimonial* evidence" but only "*circumstantial* evidence," make sport of able men who endeavor to reconcile the language of Genesis with long periods, professing admiration of "the marvellous flexibility of a language which admits of such diverse interpretations" (i.e. making a day either literal or representative of a long period, etc.—forgetting that before science compelled a rigid search of language, Augustine, when no pressure made a comparison requisite, suggested long periods as contained in the text of Scripture)? *Why* are the correspondences as given e.g. by Warring (*Scribner's Monthly*, vol. 15, in *The Mosaic Creation and Modern Science*), by Lewis (Introd. to Genesis, Lange's *Com.*), by Dawson (*Archaia; or Studies of the Cosmogony and Natural History of the Hebrew Scriptures*), and by various other writers, given but little consideration, notwithstanding the high interests at stake; while, on the other hand, works like Powell's *Order of Nature* and others, that endeavor to destroy the credibility of Genesis, that make out a "Hebrew mythology," that deal largely in the hypothetical, are lauded and magnified as superior to the scriptural teaching? *Why* is it that the evolution of the horse largely framed from sheer inference, supposition, and imagination is coolly tendered as a satisfactory rebuttal of biblical teaching, and that it is (Huxley) "much better evidence than there is for the authenticity and genuineness of the books called by the name of Moses"? *Why* is it, that, to make out a case against the Bible, unbelieving science has jumped to the conclusions (art. "Probable Age of the World" in *Quarterly Review*, 1876) of hundreds of millions (and even thirty thousand million) of years employed in the creative process, and that when forced (as Tait, Thompson, etc.) to limit to ten or fifteen million, this is regarded as too favorable to the Scriptures? *Why* is it that so much stress is laid on the formation of strata (as if separately formed, consuming immense periods of time), when eminent scientists (as Agassiz, etc.) show that they have largely been formed simultaneously? *Why* are such conclusions as to long periods given founded on the formation of coal beds, when it is admitted (e.g. in *Pop. Science Monthly*, Oct., 1874, p. 763) that wood was converted into lignite within four centuries (hence the deduction was made: "From all this it would appear that the transformation of vegetable matter into coal requires *less time* than is usually estimated by geologists; in the present instance it cannot have been over four centuries")? *Why* are deductions constantly made which remove the God of the Bible, the work of Redemption, a Divine Government, Providence, Prayer, Prophecy, etc., unless they spring from a heart and mind *prejudiced* against the Scriptures? It is hard to understand these opponents, for at one time they assert (*Pop. Sci. Monthly*, in various editorials) that religion or Christianity has nothing to do with science, and yet e.g. (*Pop. Sci. Monthly*, March, 1875, p. 625 and 626) it is declared in objection to Martineau's "Religion as affected by Mod. Materialism," that the tendency of evolution as taught, is not to lower the ideas of a Creator, but exalts the true view of the divine government of the world (but how and when he fails to tell), and that evolution is "a Philosophy of Nature, and gives a new complexion to the *great religious* questions in which the interpretation of nature is involved." Why then censure theologians and believers in their attempts to elucidate, in behalf of the Bible, such "great religious questions," especially when it is admitted, again and again, that antagonism and a conflict exist? Evolution as formulated by its advocates is "a philosophy of the origination of things" (so Spencer, etc.), and hence must, of necessity, come into contact (either in agreement or the reverse) with the Bible and Bib. Theology which deals of the origin of things. Now evolution rejects the idea especially of "special creation" (allowed by Darwin in a few primary forms, but which many of his followers reject as utterly "unscientific"). Even those (as Picton's *Mystery of Matter, and Other Essays*) who are willing, as a starting point to admit a relationship of the Infinite and Absolute, are hostile to the declarations of the Bible on the origin of things. Others, however (as e.g. editor *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, July, 1872), reject the idea of an intelligent mind originating and controlling the beginnings of nature, because both matter and mind must be relegated to an "Ultimate Reality," which it is impossible for us to know. Any position, however absurd to reason and fact, is allowable, provided it can be made to degrade the Bible teaching. No attention is paid to the valuable considerations of eminent men, which go far (as already shown) to show that the Bible and Science mutually sustain each other, and that "ignorant men" could not have concocted such remarkable points of agreement. It makes no concessions that, as able critics have stated, much of the alleged discrepancy is due to our misapprehension of the force and usage of Scripture language which makes natural law the synonym of God's will (because established and sustained by His will), which attributes directly to God what sometimes is done through natural agents; which in the phrase "let the waters bring forth abundantly every moving creature," etc., implies secondary agency to carry out the will of God (so also "Let the earth

bring forth,'' etc.) ; which simply places the Supernatural as the basis of the Natural, or makes "the Word of the Lord" the foundation of natural law and its developments ; which indicates the Supernatural willing a form, in fixing into it a permanent principle to work out its completion and that remains as its unchanging law ; which by statutes, covenant, and ordinances applied to nature indicate simply that God is the founder of the same ; which is so possessed with the idea of God being the author of all, the foundation upon which all rests, that in virtue of such relationship, acts, the product of natural law, are properly attributed to Him. But what do such suggestions amount to in the estimation of determined, prejudiced unbelief, which speaks as if all knowledge must be found in evolution? John Foster once said : "My efforts to enter into possession of the vast world of moral and metaphysical truth are like those of a mouse attempting to gnaw through the door of a granary,'' but such "mice'' claim that they are *in* the "granary,' and hold full possession ; and who *very jubilantly* can find "an irreconcilable antagonism" between Gen. 1, where the waters bring forth fowl, and Gen. 2, where the ground brings forth fowl, just as if water-fowl were not associated with waters and land-birds with dry land, and deliberately overlook the more weighty intimation of the language indicative of production *under natural law* instituted by the Creator.

A few words in relation to the unity of the human race and its antiquity. When such men as Blumenbach, Cuvier, Shubert, Karl von Raumer, John Muller (the Anatomist), Von Humboldt, Bachman, and other natural philosophers, teach the generic unity of the race, we may well consider the statements of Lubbock, Büchner, and others, as merely hypothetical. When Draper (*His. of Conflict*, p. 199) estimates man to have existed several hundred thousand years ago, he is *utterly unable* to trace back reliable human history five thousand years. The whole theory of unity and antiquity as opposed to the Bible is founded upon statements and suppositions which men eminent as scientists cannot possibly receive as established facts and authoritative. Let any unprejudiced student peruse Lester's *Pre-Adamite*, Lubbock s *Pre-Historic Times*, Wilson's *Pre-Historic Man*, and the writings of Mueller, Schmidt, Geikie, etc., on the one hand, and then, on the other, the Duke of Argyle's *Primeval Man*, Wallace's *Difficulties of Development as Applied to Man* (where some of the difficulties are frankly stated by an adherent of antiquity), Mivart's *Lessons of Nature*, Elam's *Winds of Doctrine*, De Quatrefages' *Natural History of Man* and *Crania of the Human Races*, Dr. McCosh's Reply to Huxley's Lectures, Cabell's *Testimony of Science to Unity of Mankind*, and works of a similar nature, and he will see for himself that before the Bible teaching can be eradicated its opponents must present a higher and stronger line of reasoning to overcome even the difficulties that science itself suggests. Of course, men who can make man to be derived from "the sea-mucus" (Oken), or from "worms or fishes" (Haeckel), or from "cosmic gas" (to resolve itself, as the ultimate goal, into "carbonic acid, water, and ammonia''), etc., will be delighted over such attacks, and with Büchner (Pref. to *Force and Matter*) will designate those who reject their far-fetched theories a "howling pack," "mental slaves,'' "yelping curs,'' "speculative idiots," etc. (just as if such nomenclature added proof to man's derivation, antiquity, etc.). We have books and articles by the thousand which dilate on the vast successive ages ; describe them so minutely and dogmatically as if the writers had lived through them ; make no allowance for contemporaneousness, retrogression of intelligence, co-existence of advancement and degradation, etc. A subtle anti-biblical theory is erected and paraded, built upon far-fetched inferential evidence, so that even modern Indian implements are made to figure largely in it, and even an Indian pestle used for pounding grain is converted into an ancient Phallus. Everything possible is made to contribute to its support, fully indicating the *animus*, viz., an intense anti-scriptural feeling exciting and pervading the whole, in order to invalidate the biblical account of creation, man's fall and accountability, the process of redemption, the incarnation and its relationship, etc. But we say in reference to all such topics, that the proof of the correctness of the Bible lies in the direction already indicated in Creation, and which has been fully presented. We only add a caution given by the editor of the *Galaxy* (Feb., 1877, p. 280), who, when speaking of the eagerness of some (e.g. Cocker in *The Theistic Conception of the World*) to reconcile the alleged deductions of science with the Bible, says : "The difficulty with this method of meeting the hypothesis of science is, that the scientific views are themselves in a state of unstable equilibrium. They may topple at any moment, and then the correspondence that eager devotees have found between them and the Bible is a slur that falls altogether on the religion and not on the science. This is a great error, and those who are drawn into it belittle the cause that is dear to them."

In our reading we find two points which, in addition, have called forth the special adverse criticisms of unbelief. The one is noticed e.g. by Bunsen ("Bunsen and His

Wife," *Littell's Liv. Age*, Dec. 23d, 1876), who gleefully relates how "Buckland is persecuted for asserting that fossil beasts and reptiles were Pre-Adamite," and adds: "What open infidelity! Did not death come into the world on account of Adam's sin?" Numerous writers assert that science positively teaches the existence of death before Adam's fall and death. Suppose this to be correct, it enables us to see what the Scriptures plainly teach, that death—to which Adam was liable because the tree of life was designed to avoid it—was entailed upon him in consequence of disobedience, for immortality was tendered to him only, and not to the animal creation (comp. e.g. Archd. Pratt's *Scripture and Science not at Variance*, p. 39).* A more fruitful source of sarcastic remark is the Deluge, specially indorsed by the utterances of Jesus. We frankly acknowledge great difficulties to surround the theory of an absolute universal Deluge (although reference to an Omnipotent Will can set them aside) as held e.g. by Burnet (*Sacred Theory of the Earth*), Whiston (*Theory of the Deluge*), and others. Now if we adopt the view of a partial or local Deluge—with which Scripture language corresponds—as held by Bhs. Clayton, Poole, Stillingfleet, Pye Smith, Le Clerc, Rosenmüller, Lambert, Schoebel, d'Halley, Quatrefages, Cuvier, Lester, and others, the difficulties all disappear. Let the student ponder the reasons given for a limited Deluge in Lange's *Com. on Genesis* (Amer. Ed.), Murphy's *Com. on Genesis*, art. on Deluge in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, Lenormant and Chevallier's *Ancient His. of the East*, an art. in the *Christian Review* (vol. 20) on "The Extent and Character of the Noachian Deluge," and similar writings, and he will find the objections fully and ably answered. But aside from all this, our line of reasoning, as given to sustain Creation, meets the requirements necessary to the acceptance of the biblical statements, even if we were unable to offer any other proofs for their retention.

Obs. 9. This continuous doctrine of the Kingdom effectually disposes of the argument so freely used by the Rationalistic or Naturalistic party, and recently reiterated by Froude (*Short Studies*) in supposing, that the early Fathers were not conversant with the Gospels, did not quote from them, and that hence the Gospels must be of later origin than the apostolic period. From this hypothesis, the broad assumption is drawn that the Gospels as existing were not written by the apostles, but appeared in the second or third centuries. Aside from the critical labors of Apologists which disprove this; aside from the concessions of later writers, not very friendly to the Gospels, that they cannot historically have so late an origin as many ascribe to them; aside from the quotations and accurate knowledge evinced by Celsus of their previous existence and universal acceptance by all

---

* Some recent writers have advocated the introduction of evil as resulting, not from the fall of Adam, but from that of Satan, thus answering the objections of Vogst, Combe, and others, that science proves the introduction of death—as in animals—before the creation of Adam. Keerl in his work (noticed *Bib. Sac.*, 1863, p. 756, etc.) instances a large number of theologians (as Kanne, Steir, Drechler, Riedelbach, Guerike, Tholuck, Schneider, Kurtz, Ebrard, Baumgarten, Hengstenberg, Richers Delitzsch, Engelhardt, Ranke, Reichel, Kniewel, Wichart, Lebeau, F. W. King, Rocholl, Hotho, Werner, L. Schmid), literary men (as F. von Meyer, Rougement, Hamberger, Dillmar, and others), naturalists (as Buckland, Von Schubert, K. von Raumer, A. Wagner, etc.), and philosophers (Fr. von Schlegel, Fr. von Baader, Fr. Hoffman, F. Schaden, Kreuzhage, and Moliter), as holding to it. Boehman and his theosophic successors advocated it. So even King Edgar (as quoted by Tholuck) and Origen, besides others. Whether proven or not, eminent men and deep thinkers have held to it. When considering the end contemplated and gained, viz., this Theocratic ordering, forfeited and so long lost through sin, it serves to give us a clew to God's dealings with sin and His withdrawal. Adam's guilt and Jewish sinfulness, which to unbelief seems to have been punished too severely, is seen to receive its merited punishment, not so much from the acts themselves committed (i.e. considered isolated) as from the effects which naturally resulted from them, viz., making them unworthy of being the representatives of God's Theocratic rulership, and thus forcing God, in respect to His own honor and glory, to a personal withdrawal. The first sin is a blow at Theocracy.

believers; aside from the fact that another and growing party make them as early as possible in order to prove a continuous "Jewish conception" which enveloped the apostles themselves; aside from the spirit and contradictions involved which cause one party to make Christ, after changing His first Plan, the Founder of a new religion, and another party to make Paul its founder, and still another, to make neither of them directly such but attributing the religion to an outgrowth of opinion and views previously entertained; aside from all this, the doctrine of the Kingdom *alone* utterly disproves this theory. For, leaving the appeal which one of the earliest writers makes in support of this doctrine to apostles and elders by name as taught by them, the simple fact of an unbroken, unchanged transmission—as all, both attacking and defending, admit—of *the same* idea of the Kingdom, *the same* phraseology, *the same* outlines, etc., is convincing proof that the apostolical notion is fully retained as given in the Gospels and Epistles, while the direct and indirect quotations or incorporation of language drawn from evidently earlier sources (so stated) i.e. apostolical, confirm this position. In other words, the retention of *the Jewish covenanted Messianic* idea of the Kingdom, and its *universally received* postponement to the period of the Second Advent, is the most powerful proof of *the strict historical unity* extending from the ministry of Christ down to near the fourth century. It evinces that the apostolic teaching was in both Jewish and Gentile churches *identical*, had *the same* origin and *the same* end in view; and hence that a teaching which could produce such *a unity of doctrinal position* must not only have been continuously present, as the Church contends, but must, in the nature of the case, have also assumed its alleged prominency and leadership. Let it be explained on any other ground, *how* the apostolic Fathers and their successors, East and West, adopted and taught "the Jewish conceptions" with a continuity, pertinency, and consistency with what preceded their period, indicative of a familiarity with its covenanted relationship, as evidenced by the rise of no controversy respecting its intimate union with covenant, prophecy and promise. How can all this be explained without admitting a previous acquaintance with the writings of the apostles? Is it reasonable that both Jews and Gentiles should yield up their prejudices, etc., without a knowledge of apostolic declarations on the subject? Deny such an acquaintance with apostolic writings, and how can such a phenomenon of perfect correspondence, of uniform and continuous agreement on so vital a doctrine be received without creating an immensely great difficulty (because unnatural) that in the ordinary solution at once disappears? Here, in the unity of doctrine in this one aspect, *is sufficient answer*, if it did not also meet us corroboratively in the simple narration and peculiar style of these Gospels so different from the already more amplified and ornate style of later periods. But as our object is only to indicate the influence that this doctrine has in this direction when placed in the field of controversy, rather than to extend the argument itself, we may briefly give other illustrations of its force in answering objections. How crushingly it meets that alleged against the primitive faith of the Church, first, as to Strauss, derived from the Jews (which is shown by us to be based in covenant and prophecy and *justly derived therefrom by the pious Jewish faith*); and secondly, as to Bauer, that even this Jewish derived faith in a Messiah and His Kingdom was a myth (which is logically proven by us to have *continuously existed* from the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom veritably established and its histori-

cal overthrow down to the First Advent). Nothing is taken for granted, no point is assumed, upon our side; no apology is needed for this ancient faith proven by its necessary historical existence in past and present facts; while the answer to the Kingdom not now being in existence as predicted, has its ready and overwhelming reply in its postponement. The ridicule heaped upon the Jewish faith, the early preaching of the Messianic Kingdom, the hopes entertained of the Coming again of Jesus to establish it, etc., is met, not by *abject* apologies or *philosophical* accommodation to human weakness, but by a straightforward, manly appeal to the Scriptures themselves, which give *the reasons*, as evidenced before us this day, why such faith has *not yet* been realized. This doctrine shows the fallacy of Bauer's effort to transfer the origin of Christianity from Jesus Christ to Paul. For, it proves a continuity of doctrine from the prophets through Jesus, descending to all of the apostles, and makes Paul (as many Rationalists with Apologists admit) a teacher of *this identical* Kingdom, delayed (as we show from his writings) until the Second Advent. The Gospel of the Kingdom as preached by Paul, is the same proclaimed by the other apostles, and the proof is found Props. 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, etc. Our doctrine removes the charge of "fanaticism," and "unjustifiable self-glorification" of Jesus (Strauss), when declaring His Second Coming to be that of Judge, i.e. Ruler, King of kings. For, it directs attention to previous covenant, to the Theocratic order so essential to the salvation of humanity, to the postponement, etc., which makes a Second Coming imperative; and, in view of a consideration of the whole Divine Plan with its historical attestments based upon man's needs, vindicates from the nature, design, and end contemplated by this Kingdom the assurance thus given by Jesus. It shows how the superhuman element in Jesus is not confined to one Gospel, but stands forth in all of them as a necessary pre-requisite to meet the requirements of covenant, prophecy, and Kingdom. It indicates why the Supernatural pertaining to the Exodus—interwoven with Jewish literature, rites, history, etc.—cannot be rejected owing to its subserving a certain covenanted purpose or plan (its failure temporarily also predicted being unnatural from a mere human standpoint), and which stands interlaced with and proven by present promises experienced and present history witnessed. It removes the arguments against the Bible statements drawn from the theological theories concerning, and extravagant eulogies bestowed upon the Church, as if it were the covenanted Kingdom of David's Son, etc.—from which unbelief infers that if such, then neither covenant nor prophecy meet with a fair and honest fulfilment, and hence neither of them are true. For it places the Church in its proper relation as also a noble preparatory stage (without denying God's sovereignty, etc.) to the establishment of the Kingdom, thus preserving prophecy intact, yea, even showing how all this was predicted and is realized, before the ultimate fulfilment; and thus indorsing, with thankfulness for the labor bestowed, the researches, in many respects, made in the history of the early Church both by Rationalism and Apologetics. It commends itself on higher grounds to the opponents of Christianity on account of the principle of interpretation (being also their own) which underlies the reception of this Kingdom; the appeal to reason requisite to understand this Theocratic arrangement; the necessary mixed condition of the Church; the perpetuity of the earth; salvation of the race; order of government; meaning of Judgeship of Christ and the judgment day; enlarged view of the Redeemer's work and

world position ; superadded agency of the Supernatural ; position of the Jewish nation, etc., which find their true intent brought out *in relationship* with this Theocratic Kingdom. This doctrine explains satisfactorily why the Theocratic Kingdom when established never developed into the dimensions of a mighty world empire ; why it is permitted in God's providence that there should be progress at one time and retrogression at another ; why earthly kingdoms are allowed to oppress the Church, and hostile powers to array themselves against the truth ; why the great disturbing element of evil has so long possessed the sway of the world ; why the withdrawal of God personally from the world continues ; why trial and suffering are given to the believing sons and daughters ; why so much preparatory work is requisite, etc., and it does this all *by a consideration of the Divine Purpose as contemplated in the Kingdom itself,* carefully observing the order laid down, and demonstrating that, whatever temporary postponement may exist, both evil and good, apparent failure and prosperity, are made to contribute toward a Plan which God designs to accomplish in opposition to all antagonistic forces without interfering with the free moral agency of man.[1] In all this the credibility, etc., of the Word is the more fully sustained. But while thus, in kindness of spirit, opposing by argument the Rationalistic and Naturalistic schools who endeavor to lessen these, we, on the other hand, have not spared, with all charity, the logical inconsistencies of the professed Orthodox. This has been clearly set forth under various Propositions and needs no repeating. Indeed, from this very circumstance and from our frankness, in several places, to acknowledge the correctness and propriety of Rationalistic objections imperfectly met by Apologists, it will not surprise us if some of the Orthodox will attack us with more bitterness than the former party. But we must fully indorse the opinion of Dawson (expressed before the Evang. Alliance of 1873) and many others, that the manner in which unbelief has been met by weak accommodations, by giving up of reason and only seeking refuge in faith, by pitiful concessions, by irrelevant interpretation, by adding to the Word of God what does not belong to it, by inconsistency of statements, by the intervention and authority of human dogmas, Church authority, decrees to settle difficulties, etc., has made—with most honorable exceptions here and there—the Church in a measure justly chargeable with injuring the truth and driving men struggling earnestly and laboriously for light into an unfortunate attitude of antagonism unfavorable to impartial investigation and reception of truth. And, in some of the discussions, rejoinders and answers, it is not too much to say that on both sides there has also been an imitation of King James (instanced by Macaulay, *His. Eng.*), who silenced those who objected to any of his propositions by simply repeating them in the same words as the most effectual mode of argumentation. All this has had an influence (because no allowance is made for human weakness and imperfection) upon the minds of many in detracting from the truthfulness (although fairly delineated as something to be expected) of the Word of God. From this, too, perhaps in a measure, springs the desire so recently exhibited in comparative theology of bringing forth a natural religion of humanity formed out of the various religious systems in the world. The effort now made to build up such a religion out of the elements of all others, is an old one. We find it in the Alexandrian teacher, Ammonius Saccas (Killen, *The Old Cath. Church*, p. 11), " who endeavored to show that all systems of religion and philosophy contained the elements of truth." The

effect of such a theory on Origen and others is apparent from their writings. A certain uniformity of religious or moral ideas arising from the structure of man and nature, and their relationship to a known or unknown Supreme Power, has led recent writers to enter this field (which Dr. Spiess justly urged upon the Evang. Alliance of 1873 as worthy of special cultivation in its bearing upon Christian Apologetics) with the hope, evidently, of invalidating the claims of Christianity ; persistently overlooking how many of the facts adduced by them really confirm the biblical account of man's creation, sense of moral responsibility, need of mediation, etc. With *professed* respect for the Christian religion (which their line of argument imperatively demands) really *an enthusiastic* regard for heathendom is exhibited to the disparagement of the former ; for the antiquities of heathen religions are placed not only in the same category with the Christian, but even elevated above it. Eulogy, excessive admiration for moral sayings, etc., in Oriental systems of belief (which, if the Bible is true, ought, in the nature of the case, to be manifested more or less in man), while the faintest praise is bestowed upon the sublime utterances of the Bible, lead us reasonably to suspect the intent of a number of works on the subject. But every such writer, as can be seen by his writings, deals unfairly with the Bible, since in such a comparative view the Divine Plan running through the book, the progressive development of Divine Purpose in Holy Writ (as we have indicated it), is *entirely left out* of the question, and the merits, common origin, etc., of Christianity or the Bible and heathendom is to be determined by detached portions, isolated fragments taken from each, and then cemented together by speculation and hypothesis. Of course in such a mode of comparison *the Bible must suffer.* But take the line of argument previously indicated, and the incomparable nature of Christianity—as part of a Divine Plan relating to the Kingdom of God, as part of a pre-determined and historically attested Theocratic arrangement—shines forth *pre-eminent* above all other systems, which, whatever truth they may contain, are weighed down with an oppressive load of appendages sufficiently indicative of their origin. No, if man wants relief, it *only* comes through the Word of God, and not through sophistical or philosophical theories, as is singularly manifested in the fact that many who brought forward subtle theories hostile in spirit and tendency to the Word, yet privately (vide Hurst's *History of Rationalism,* for example) held to the Bible as their *only* hope and comfort.[2]

[1] It might be regarded invidious to specify by name particular works of Poetic Pantheism, Anti-Christian Theism, Spiritualism, Liberalism, Naturalism, Communism, Humanitarianism, etc.—together with the recent revampings of Oriental, Egyptian, Pythagorean and Platonic notions of transmigration, etc., with scientific (?) ideas of ascension and progression attached—which this doctrine of a covenanted Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom in its scriptural unity is specially adapted to meet from its peculiar and distinctive standpoints, covenanted, historical, predicted, preached, postponed, etc. As to the adoption, with reserved meanings of religious and scriptural phraseology by so many of the unbelievers, we have only to say that it reminds us of the natural manœuvres of the young cuckoo hatched in the nest of his stranger nurse, and then striving to throw out his foster sisters and brothers.

[2] Briefly we may indicate how this doctrine of the Kingdom serves to explain much that otherwise will be dark. Thus unbelief asks, why does not God come *now,* in this dispensation, and manifest Himself as He once did under the Theocracy and in behalf of the Jews? The answer is *plainly given* in the Word. The withdrawal of the Theocracy and, as a consequence, of God, is a punishment inflicted for an allotted period. We are now in "the times of the Gentiles." *Respect* for His own official position as Theocratic

King and *a due regard* for the fulfilment of His threatened punishment, causes this hiatus of direct *Personal* Supernatural guidance and intervention. It is only when the time has arrived for the restoration of the Theocracy that God's *special presence* is again restored; this is clearly revealed. Again, exception is taken to the testing of Abraham's faith in the case of Isaac, and of various Mosaic institutions that largely call for prompt trust and obedience, but *the key* to all these is found in the covenanted relationship resulting in a Theocratic ordering, which as its foundation, requires supreme confidence in God and unhesitating obedience to His requirements. A Theocracy without this element cannot, *in justice* to the Ruler, possibly exist. Again, our line of argument would powerfully sustain the points made by Henry Rogers in *The Supernatural Origin of the Bible inferred from itself*, as e.g. (1) how, considering the inveterate proneness of man to idolatry, the Jews came to have a monopoly of Monotheism? How was this notion introduced and developed against prejudice, and the tendencies of human nature, unless by a divine ordering? The Theocratic ordering indicates *how* it was necessarily given, fostered, and preserved as *an essential* element. (2) How the supremacy of God, His will, etc., is made against natural tendencies, so continuous and vital a subject, involving a sublimity which must rise from a divine source. The doctrine of the Kingdom shows *how* this was brought about and cherished over against revolts and rejections. (3) The conception of the character, etc., of Jesus too high for mere Jews, and hence cannot be ascribed to a purely human hypothesis. This delineation, as we have shown, is to be attributed to *the Theocratic ordering* in fulfilment of covenant, etc. (4) How Jews, rising above deep and powerful prejudices, could suddenly become preachers of the Gospel of love to all men. Our argument shows that it was still "the Gospel of the Kingdom"—a Kingdom indeed postponed, but still *the Theocratic Kingdom*, dear to every Jew, to which, preparatorily, they could now invite all to become, by faith in the Messiah, heirs and coheirs with "the Christ." Indeed, there is scarcely a point of importance and interest to which the doctrine of the Kingdom does not add force.

Obs. 10. The logical, consistent outgrowth of scientific unbelief is the denial of the Supernatural. This is plainly stated by its advocates and must be accepted. Thus e.g. Bastian, an Evolutionist (*Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Ap., 1874), in "Evolution and the Origin of Life," frankly declares that evolution necessarily implies such continuity and uniformity, that *no possible place* can be given to Supernatural interference, special providences, etc., saying: "Those who embrace the evolution philosophy are foremost in this opinion; they believe that no effects of whatsoever kind can occur without adequate causes, and, the conditions being similar, that the same results will always follow the action of any given cause. Their whole creed is, in fact, pre-eminently based upon this assumed uniformity of nature." He declares that consistency demands the unchangeable laws of nature, removing special creation, a divine government, a superintending providence; and takes to task such scientists who venture out of this "assumed" ground (as Darwin, in allowing special creative act in progenitors; as Spencer and Huxley in not admitting that life-evolution can take place now; as Tyndall in accepting such a limitation, and adding the notion that "the physical agencies which promote the growth of living matter are now incapable of causing its origination"). Numerous writers take the same decided position, viz., not to limit nature in its operations. Thus e.g. Fowle (*Science and Immortality*) in reply to Max Müller, attributes all, physical, mental, moral, and religious, to natural evolution. It is true that some resist such wholesale deductions, as e.g. Carpenter (*Pop. Science Monthly*, Nov., 1872) emphatically opposes the materialism of "the Nature Philosophers" (illustrated in Büchner's *Force and Matter*), expressing himself, "that science points to (though I should be far from saying that it demonstrates) the origination of all power in mind," and adds: "When metaphysicians, shaking off the bugbear of materialism, will hon-

estly and courageously study the phenomena of the mind of man in their relation to those of his body, I believe that they will find in that relation their best arguments for the presence of *infinite mind* in universal nature." While he calls upon scientific men to resist the gross views of Büchner, Miss Martineau, and others, which make nature itself the ultimate outcome, it is a sad fact that multitudes indorse the latter in preference, and fully declare by their published opinions that "*the world by wisdom knew not God.*" Take, for instance, the mildest form of unbelieving expression as found in Darwin (comp. *What is Darwinism?* by Dr. Hodge), and while a Theism is not absolutely rejected as an ultimate cause, yet the scale from evolution to natural selection (as the cause) culminates in making natural selection to be without design and conducted solely by *unintelligent* physical causes; and this a reviewer (*Scribner's Monthly*, July, 1874) correctly says, causes such *an irreconcilable antagonism* between Darwinism and theology that no alliance between the two is possible. This assertion is confirmed by the increased and constantly increasing chasm existing between them, as presented by writers on both sides. The doctrine of evolution, with its support of natural selection, may find and has its supporters among Christian Theistic writers, but the conclusion engrafted upon it is of a nature *so hostile* to the direct teaching of the creative and Supernatural in the Bible that all believers in Holy Writ must recoil from it. And yet this conclusion of *unintelligent* physical causes dominating over all, is pressed upon us from all sides as the legitimate one to be received. We see in this, viewed from the standpoint of our doctrine, three things inevitably resulting: 1. That it is vain for men to imagine that even a compromise between such antagonisms can be effected; 2. that it is absurd and foolish to hide from ourselves the existence of such a conflict; and 3. that it is *only preparatory* to that naturalism and humanitarianism which is to introduce the culminated Antichrist.

Let us observe a little more extendedly these three particulars indicative of a denial of inspiration. First: it is hopeless to anticipate a compromise between these extremes. It is true that a conservative class exists which thinks that the doctrine of evolution can be reconciled with Christianity, or that, at least, no antagonism need arise between them. One of the ablest of this party is Asa Gray (*Darwiniana: Essays and Reviews pertaining to Darwinism*), "who is (Preface) scientifically and in his own fashion a Darwinian, philosophically a convinced theist, and religiously an acceptor of 'the creed, commonly called the Nicene,' as the exponent of the Christian faith." He holds that there need be no conflict between true Science and Religion, that a harmony will ultimately exist between them as both advance, and that evolution, properly apprehended, teaches and impresses the doctrine of purpose and design in nature, etc. With this quite a number agree, such e.g. as Leifchild (*The Great Problem*), who brings forth an "Evolver" that "must be divine;" or Principal Tullock (*Littell's Liv. Age*, Ap. 15th, 1876), who brings forth "spiritual evolution;" or Radcliffe (Lec. before the Royal Col. of Physicians," March, 1873, in *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, July, 1873), who cleaves to a Creator of original forms; or James Martineau (*Religion as Affected by Mod. Materialism*), who endeavors to avoid the extremes of evolution; so likewise Joseph Le Conte (*Religion and Science*), Henslow (*The Theory of Evolution of Living Things, and the Application of the Principles of Evolution to Religion*), Smythe (*The Bible and the Doc. of Evolution*), etc. The *Pop. Sci. Monthly* (Feb., 1875) designates the following "Mod. Sci. Materialism" (in *Blackwood's Mag.*, Nov., 1874), "What would Tyndall be at?" (in the *Penn. Monthly*, Dec., 1874, by R. C. Thompson) and "Ideas overlooked by Dr. Tyndall," by Dr. McCosh (in the *International Review*, Jan., 1875), as agreed in the reception of evolution, provided it be based *on a Theistic* ground. It is claimed by such that evolution only produces a larger for a narrower view of design; that it cannot and does not dispose of divine design in nature, and hence implies an intelligent will that put it in operation. One of the most eloquent, Dr. McCosh, says: "Establish whatever facts you please in regard to the workings of nature and the

order of the universe, and behind the whole phenomenal scheme I find *the Infinite Mind* by which it was all designed." St. Clair (*Darwinism and Design; or Creation by Evolution*), the "Non-Conformist," and others take the same position, and claim that such a view impresses a higher estimate of Creative design. Allow that evolution and natural selection can be, to some extent, incorporated without violence, yet this is simply the opinion of those who desire to retain, as much as possible, the Bible teaching intact. It is *not* the opinion of the leading advocates of evolution, for these *most deliberately and persistently* reject the Scriptures, and even if some allow some kind of a Theistic element, as a First Cause, it is immensely different to *the Personal God of the Bible*. The proof of a direct hostility to the Bible is abundant, as presented in their published statements respecting Genesis, Moses, the Supernatural, Christianity based on the reception of the Old Test., etc. Contempt and scorn are freely expressed at the ignorance and credulity that can accept of Biblical ideas and conceptions respecting the world, the universe, the origin of things, the relation of the divine, etc. When even the effort is made (e.g. by Lowne in Actonian Prize Essay, *The Philosophy of Evolution*, to illustrate "the Wisdom and Beneficence of the Almighty") to unite a Natural Theology with Evolution, it finds (illustrated in *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Nov., 1873, p. 116) but little favor. A personal Creator, a God to whom we are responsible, a divine revelation which demands obedience, *must be ignored*. The repentance, faith, godliness, etc., required in the Scriptures is deemed childish. The Bible itself, and its product Christianity, are the result of *natural* influences, and must be classed with other natural religions. Jevon ("Evolution and the Doctrine of Design," *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, May, 1874) may argue for an infinite intelligent mind behind evolution, and Smith (*Evolution and a Personal God*, delivered in Christ's Church, New York) may insist upon the Personality of the Being directing evolution, and confidently assert "that it is hostile to no interest of Christianity," "that even if the theory is true, it affects no interest of Christianity injuriously," but the most superficial acquaintance with the Bible and with the writings of leading evolutionists, teaches *the reverse*. It is simply impossible and impracticable to unite with the positive teachings of the Bible such a diluted and refined recognition of the Creator as these writers advocate; for they overlook the fact that evolutionists, as a class, deny the positive declarations of the Bible on the subject (hence the refining process introduced to make the same, if possible, palatable), and that multitudes are driven into hostility to Christianity by the theory as advocated. Its reception by theologians is done at *a fearful sacrifice* of Bible teaching, unless it be so modified that it becomes unpalatable to unbelieving scientists.

Second: it is foolish to hide from ourselves the existence of such a conflict. Suppose it to be true, as compromisers advocate, that evolution in its leading teachings can be reconciled to the Bible; that the seven Mosaic creative periods are preserved; that the evolution of living things through the force of law inaugurated by a Creator can be shown, etc., still the fact remains that leading advocates of the theory and a vast multitude of adherents *refuse to accept of any such compromise*, flatly deny the existence of the Supernatural, and attribute all to the force and perpetuity of natural law. Admit that no necessary conflict needs to exist between science and religion; that as investigation progresses a complete reconciliation can be effected, etc., yet the fact remains that science as given by many scientific men is *in direct opposition* to the teaching of the Bible. A thousand works of ability painfully attest the fact. A multitude of works for, or against, evolution, and many endeavoring to effect a compromise, evidence such a conflict. Suppose the main facts of evolution can be received in agreement with Bible teaching respecting the antiquity of the earth and man, and it can be shown (e.g. Introd. to Genesis, *Lange's Com.*, Amer. Ed., etc.) that there is a wonderful agreement as to periods, time, evolution of inorganic and organic forms, etc., does this affect *the continued opposition* of scientific unbelief? No! the conflict between faith and unbelief is increasing, as seen in the articles and utterances of leading periodicals. The deductions of alleged science, if only hostile to the Word, are received in preference, and efforts are constantly put forth to heighten the antagonism. When eminent men (like Huxley, Draper, Carpenter, Wallace, Darwin, Tyndall, Galton, Compte, Mill, Spencer, Lubbach, Lewes, Scmidt, and others) frankly admit the hostility existing between their theories and the Bible, and when we behold the fruitage of unbelief in their followers, it is folly *to ignore* that which is self-evident, dangerous, and destructive. Haywood ("Spiritual Pirates," *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, March, 1875) certainly gives good advice not to follow the proscriptive condemnation of scientists to whom we are indebted for valuable acquisitions, etc., but this does not prevent their attacks upon the Bible. "Liberal" theologians, caring very little about preserving the integrity of the Bible (having themselves *no faith* in its special inspiration), cordially strike hands with unbelief and fritter away the

Supernatural, and this indication of weakness only confirms and strengthens the bitterness against Christianity. When Draper insists upon a conflict existing, it will not answer for Brownson, Hill, Deems, and others, to deny such a conflict; while the former pushes his view to an extreme by making the Bible and Christianity responsible for the opposition of some of its adherents to scientific facts in the past, the latter go to an opposite extreme by ignoring the array of unbelief and hostility evidenced by scientific men and their followers. Chancellor Winchell (*The Doctrine of Evolution*) may justly argue that Spencer's "Unknowable" is "Knowable;" Washburn (*Address to Medical Students*) may logically declare that "evolution is but a vague name for the living action of a living God;" Mason (*Evolution and the After Life*) may deduct from evolution "a great first and adequate cause" which leads to "a central soul;" Trowbridge (*Science in the Pulpit*) and Smith (*Speculations in Science*) may give excellent advice as to the manner of conducting controversy and indulge hopes of an ultimate compromise, but these, and others like them, *cannot conceal* the plain fact that multitudes—irrespective of advice, compromises, explanations, etc.—persist *in a bitter and unrelenting hostility* to the Bible. Admit from the Christian standpoint that it is uncalled for, inconsistent, and unscientific, yet *it exists* and extends itself, because adapted to the heart and wishes of its advocates. If the reader desires to know how scientific men insist upon a conflict as actually existing, he can readily find it, e.g. in *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, June, 1875 (*Draper and His Critics*), May, 1872 (Fowle on *Science and Immortality*), White's *Warfare of Science*, Youman's *Herbert Spencer and the Doctrine of Evolution*, etc. As illustrative we refer to Deems's *Science and Religion* in the *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Feb., 1876, where he speaks of this conflict as "ephemeral," etc. The editor in his notice of it advocates *a real and continued conflict;* and that it is not illusive presents the attitude of many Christian believers who regard the professed scientific statements concerning the origin of life, evolution of forms, antiquity of man, etc., as "dangerous" and "materialistic." After frankly declaring that "materialistic science is aiming to cut up religion by the roots," he candidly says: "Science must go on, and if her results thus far are bad there is *no prospect* that they will be better in the future. There can be only one basis of substantial peace, and that is the entire indifference of religious people, *as such*, to the results of scientific inquiry." Now what harmony can there be with such demands, or what confidence can we place in the assertions of Deems, Bixby, Murphy, Pratt, Hinton, Peabody, and others of a coming reconciliation (at a fearful sacrifice of biblical declarations). Men like Johnson (*Science and Religion*) may affirm that there is no connection between science and religion, but the attacks of Tyndall, Mill, Spencer, and a host of others upon scriptural teaching invalidates all such special pleading. Hodge (*What is Darwinism?*) and others, are right in recognizing this evil tendency, and from a scriptural standpoint denouncing it as irreligious and pernicious; the proof of which is abundantly manifested in books and periodicals.

Third: Such scientific unbelief is only preparatory to the predicted Naturalism and Humanitarianism which will culminate in the last Antichrist. This has been shown under Props. 161, 162, 163, 180, etc., so that it becomes, as exhibited in Prop. 174, a distinctive and highly important sign. Many writers already take the position of one in "Darwinism and Divinity" (*Pop. Sci. Monthly*, June, 1872), viz., that while evolution, etc., removes the miraculous and Supernatural, while it supersedes and banishes the teaching of the Bible, yet because man is a religious animal with organs "whose function it is to produce religion, because religious instincts are indestructible," a religion of some kind—a natural religion—must be substituted; and this religion will be formulated under the rule: "Religions thrive by a kind of *natural selection.*" What is this but the entering wedge to the fulfilment of God's Word respecting the culminated Antichrist! The highest intelligence, the most vigorous minds are engaged in this destructive work, to fulfil the prediction of Herbert Spencer (*The Study of Sociology*, under educational bias), that "the humanity of the remote future will have but one religion," i.e. *a natural one.* This class have praise for Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius, etc. (as e.g. Tyndall in *Inaugural Address*), but not a word in favor of the Bible; indeed the latter must be attacked under the specious cloak of the "Miltonian hypothesis." While some in scientific unbelief may retain a form of Theism, *very different*, however, from the biblical conception, many resolve all into *Naturalism*, of whom Gladstone (*Pop. Sci. Month.*, Feb., 1874) says: "Upon the ground of what is termed evolution, God is relieved of the labor of creation; in the name of unchangeable laws, He is discharged from governing the world." This is the class that will prevail *according to prophecy.* Principal Dawson (*The so-called Conflict of Science and Religion*) and others may truthfully say that this is not the result of "true science" and "true religion," but God who knows the heart of man fore-

tells us that *the depravity of man* will bring it forth, denying the claims of God. Many prophets arise who are predicting "peace, peace." White (*The Warfare of Science*), willing to sacrifice much that is essential to the inspiration and integrity of the Scriptures, ridiculing the efforts made to resist the encroachments of unbelief, predicts a glorious future under the auspices of science. Spencer (*First Principles*) holds to the possibility of an ultimate reconciliation between science and religion, but only when religion is willing to abandon fundamental biblical ideas. Shields (*The Final Philosophy*) advocates a complete harmony between science and religion by the interposition of philosophy, the arbitration of the latter being all-powerful. Gill (*Evolution and Progress*), fully admitting the wide extent and destructive tendencies abroad, urging the reception of the Spencerian philosophy, predicts a union and a glorious future. So numerous writers declare the future supremacy of *unbelieving science*. The Bible, under divine inspiration, teaches us that unbelief will triumph ; and that its victory is hastened by the concessions, advocated sacrifices, one-sided compromises of professed believers cannot be doubted.

Obs. 11. We confess ourselves old-fashioned enough, and such a believer in the representations of Scripture, to believe that reason, honestly exercised, can see the work of an intelligent Creator in the sky above us, on the earth beneath us, and in the world around us. The old argument derived from design, wisdom, contrivance, utility, etc., is as fresh and vigorous to-day as when it came from inspired teaching (e.g. Ps. 94 : 9, 10, "*He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not He know?*), or fell from the lips of Jesus (e.g. Matt. 6 : 25–34, in reference to "the fowls of the air" and "the lilies of the field"). The production of the bird in the egg, the animal in the womb, the eye in darkness, the ear in seclusion, the mechanical adaptations, the ten thousand thousand contrivances and relations indicative of intelligent design, all force us to the position of Bacon : "Sooner would I believe all the fables of the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind." The book of nature corroborates the announcements of the Book of Revelation respecting the might, wisdom, goodness, etc., of a Creator.

Men may ridicule the biblical conception of a Creator exhibiting His divine attributes in Creation, and able, at any moment, to manifest His power and control over the same. They may designate such a God, "An Almighty Clockmaker," but after all reason must acknowledge that the Bible gives *the highest and most comforting* idea of the Power which established the order and energy of the universe. To make all the expression of fixed law, or of the natural development of forces, and not allow *an intelligent Will* to be manifested, or to have control over His own work is, to say the least, giving no hope of ultimate Redemption from the growing curse. The evidences of design in Creation are indicative of a Personal God, who predetermined and arranged that natural law should bring forth the results witnessed. This is advocated by a long list of able writers, Paley, Butler, Chalmers, the Duke of Argyle, McCosh, Bascome, Bremer, Chadbourne, Walker, Child, Thompson, Cook, and many others. The effort is indeed made to prevent nature from testifying in behalf of Bible statements (as Tyndall), and some professed Christians express their willingness to give up all natural teaching to the sciences (as Martineau), but teleology refers its wonders to a higher source than mere natural causes, and shows us that we are under *divine* government. The last idea is the one which really excites the most hostility, for it is to rid themselves of the notion *of moral obligation* that many refuse to arise above nature. They want no divine government, and in their eagerness to crush such a conception, they attribute all to matter, or force, or law. They, too, will hastily announce as scientific conclusions, as facts, theories which are still unproven (see e.g. art. in *Brit. Review*, May, 1860), if they can only be employed to weaken faith in the Bible, or in a Christian view of nature. Scientific men (like Agassiz, etc.) who, more or less, favor a biblical conception of nature, are taken to task for expressing such a faith. This is the more astonishing when some of the leading writers on evolution have expressly declared that there is a limit to our knowledge of nature. Thus e.g. Emil Du Bois-Reymond in *The Limits of our Knowledge of Nature* (an address delivered at the Forty-fifth

Congress of German Naturalists and Physicians at Leipsic, and found in the *Pop. Sci. Monthly*, May, 1874), limits our knowledge of nature in the ultimate causes of life-evolution, the laws of nature, the production of intelligence and consciousness, the comprehension of matter and force. Now the only rational way—pointed out by the Scriptures—to bridge such chasms is the reception and advocacy of *an Intelligent Creator*, whose intelligence, wisdom, and power is made manifest in His works. And this leads us not to "nature worship," an admiration merely of law, force, design, adaptedness, and harmony, but to a reverence for, and adoration of, nature's God. This, too, leads us to avoid the one extreme (Duke of Argyle in his *Reign of Law*), which lays such stress on the existence of natural law as to limit the Lawgiver's ability to interfere, etc., at will, and the other extreme (Bacon in his *Reign of God not the Reign of Law*) which makes God's Will constantly and directly exerted in all matters without the establishment of an ordering (in which God's Will is manifested) resulting in a general uniformity of action. A due medium between the two is the scriptural teaching, which recognizes law in all ordinary operations, beholds God's Will expressed in them, sees His wisdom and power brought out through them, and yet makes the Divine Will, the Supernatural, *superior* to those laws, and able to control them *at pleasure*. The natural and the Supernatural are related ; the former is the product of the latter ; a reference to the one suggests the other, and hence they are not to be separated. Studying God's works, we need not feel alarmed at the startling theories sprung upon us, as e.g. the doctrine of "spontaneous generation," of which even Tyndall (Dis. at the Royal Institution, July 8, 1877) said "there is not a shadow of evidence in favor of the doctrine." We need not be very much concerned respecting evolution, when (so *The Armory*) man does not "evolute" on so that he can fly as the bird, swim as the fish, scent as the dog, run as the deer, etc. Savage (*The Religion of Evolution*) taxes our faith immensely more than the Bible does, when he makes all things and life itself to be derived from "a primitive fire-mist or nebula." Fiske, in his attack upon Agassiz (*Pop. Sci. Monthly*, Oct., 1873), exhibits marvellous faith when he advocates the existence of all things without the producing cause of a "creative will" or "free action of an intelligent mind" (being "a mere figment of ancestral imagination") ; Tyndall advances far into the region of faith, *child-like faith*, when e.g. he remarks : "Matter I define as that *mysterious thing* by which all this" (i.e. the whole series of phenomena in nature to the self-conscious life of man) "has been accomplished ;" Büchner exhibits *an astounding trust* in his delineation of *Force and Matter*, and the ultimate finding of the missing links ; so much is faith evoked that Sara S. Hennell in her *Thoughts in aid of Faith*, gathered chiefly from recent works in Theology and Philosophy, quotes from Feuerbach, Spencer, Buckle, Powell, Compte, Strauss, Parker, and others in behalf of a "Faith" that shall take the place of the "Old Theologic Faith." Surely, in view of all this, we ought not to be censured when we also, with Paul (Heb. 11 : 3, etc.), introduce the element of faith, because we "*see through a glass darkly.*" Strange that men should deny the evidences of a preconceived intelligent design in Creation, and go into ecstasies of faith over the evidences of design in the rude "flint-chips," making them indicative of intelligent human design indefinite ages before Adam ; or as Rogers's (*Ch. Union*, Sept. 19, 1877) remarks : "It seems strange that these gentlemen who refuse to admit the evidence of design in the whole material universe, should be so outrageously indignant with any of us if we hesitate for a moment to admit the evidence of design in a flint chip." The fact is, that science and philosophy corroborates the truth of man's position that it is largely one of faith, from which we cannot release ourselves (comp. Dr. Sprecher's *Groundwork of Theology*, Williamson's *Rud. Theology and Moral Science*, etc.), because from a lack of absolute knowledge and a constant contact with the unknown or dimly seen, we must be content *with relative* knowledge, according with personal experience and consciousness.

PROPOSITION 199. *This doctrine of the Kingdom materially aids in deciding the great Christological question of the day.*

It has been justly remarked by many writers that the question that Jesus asked (Matt. 22 : 42) the assembled Pharisees : "*What think ye of Christ?*" is the great question of the day, seeing that the attack upon and the defence of Christianity, for the last twenty or more years, has centered upon the Person of Jesus Christ. The numerous works issued by both parties respecting the Person, Life, and Work of Jesus is evidence of the deep interest taken in the subject, and which, in view of the approach of the Antichrist, is *precisely* the condition of things that we ought *to expect* in order to insure a fulfilment of the Word.

How persons approach this subject may be illustrated by several examples. Thus the divinity of the Christ, the making Himself God, one with the Father, is a difficulty with cultivated unbelievers as shown in the case of the intelligent German (mentioned by Pentecost in the *Christian Union*, Jan. 24, 1877), who justly observed that Jesus "died in defence of the claim." The difficulty vanishes by noticing that *the covenanted Theocratic relationship* demands it in order that completed redemption, as the Divine Purpose contemplates, may be obtained and God be honored and glorified. On the other hand, Gibbon—overlooking for the moment the general objection of unbelievers respecting the ascribed and claimed divinity—sneeringly remarks (*Decl. and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 4, p. 489, footnote) : "Chrysostom (Basnage, *His. of the Jews*, vol. 5, p. 183) and Athanasius (*Petav. Dogmat. Theol.*, tom. 5, l. 1, c. 2, p. 3) are obliged to confess that the divinity of Christ is rarely mentioned by Himself or His apostles." In this no allowance is made that (1) a sufficiency is given to know "the Christ ;" (2) that this sufficiency has been so ample as to influence the believers (including Chrysostom and Athanasius) to receive, heartily, the claims of divinity as essential ; (3) that this sufficiency is so great and decided that it has urged unbelievers to make it the leading objection to Jesus ; (4) that the lack of reiteration results, not from a weakening of the claim, but from the simple fact that Jesus, as the Christ, being covenanted in the Davidic line, requisite stress, for purpose of identification and faith, must also be laid on the human side of Christ (comp. e.g. Props. 81–84) ; (5) and that the Divine Purpose as exhibited in and through "the Christ" can only be obtained by a comparison and reception of Scripture. Again, Gail Hamilton (*What Think Ye of Christ?*) finds divinity in Christ, but no acknowledged or assumed Deity. This follows, however, from only considering one part of the subject, viz., His powers as derived, His expressions of inferiority, etc. (which one aspect of Christ—as covenanted in the line of David—must necessarily develop, being also "the Son of Man"), and setting aside another, and equally positive, set of passages which present us with another aspect of "the Christ."

Miss Cobbe (*Broken Lights*, p. 155) asserts that through "the invention," or "exaggeration, or homage of adoring disciples," Jesus was by stages magnified from "the prophet into the Messiah, the Messiah into the Son of God, and the Son of God into the Incarnate Logos—Himself a God." She utterly fails to grasp *the Theocratic idea* involved in the title "Messiah" (comp. Obs. 2), which includes the rest, and totally ignores the Old and New Test. conception of "the Messiah," i.e. the Theocratic King, causing her to make "the Life of Jesus" "the great Allegory of Humanity." Strauss (*The Old Faith and the New*) dogmatically and sweepingly declares : "An object of religious adoration must have a divinity, and *thinking men* have long since ceased to regard the founder of Christianity as such." The concession in the first part of the sentence cannot be set

aside by the imperious and uncandid statement of the latter part. The *deepest, most profound* thinkers of the world have bowed in adoration to Jesus Christ, and men of the highest intelligence and talent, impressed by the Divine Plan pertaining to Christ and the Truth in Him, continue to adore Him. The reasons for such an adoration will follow. Probably the lowest method of attack against the divinity of Jesus is that resorted to by some Spiritualists, who represent the spirits of former advocates of the divinity (as e.g. John Wesley in Boynton's *Unfoldings*, p. 7) as now denying its truthfulness. The *meanness* of such a procedure is only equalled by the brazen impudence that suggests it.

Obs. 1. The truth and power of Christianity, the validity and realization of the covenants depend upon Jesus "the Christ," and hence the respective answers that faith and enlightened reason on the one hand, and unbelief and unaided reason on the other present for our consideration. The question, "*Who is Jesus?*" will be, so far as the world is concerned, decided *adversely* to Christianity; for we are assured that the time is certainly coming when *the Christship* of Jesus will be denied, *the claims* of His Messiahship will be ignored and scorned, and Antichrist shall gain, for a brief period, *the complete victory* in the contest, but, thank God, *not* by the force of reason or legitimate weapons, but, as the Spirit informs us, by "deceit," "lying wonders," "making war with the saints and overcoming them," and killing all who will not worship him or his image. The looming Antichrist tells the sad story of the final issue of the present struggle; corrupt humanity—notwithstanding the noble efforts of able, learned, pious defenders of the Messiahship—will secure a bloody triumph, which the long-suffering God will cut short in righteousness. The victory will indeed be short lived; for (1 John 2 : 22, etc.) the denial of Jesus as "the Christ," not merely in theory, or in individual practice, or in books, but then extended to the highest of earthly relations in civil and religious government, and manifested in the murderous effort of the nations, under the leadership of the last head of the revived beast, to blot out of existence the adherents of the hated name, will bring forth, to the joy and triumph of the lovers of Jesus, such *an open decision* of the question that even our enemies, smitten by terror at the exhibition of might and majesty, will no longer doubt.

In the mean time, those who have decided this question by the noblest of tests, viz., a personal reception of Christ and the actual realization of the power of faith in Him, must hold their souls in patience; must not be alarmed at the inroads of infidelity; must testify to the truth whether men believe or not; must, according to the ability given to them, hold up the preciousness of Christ, and warn both the Church and the world, of His Coming wrath against those, who, despising light, love, mercy, pity, forbearance, etc., refuse to answer this question biblically. In the contest going on, no one who is a believer is exempt from witnessing for Christ; and the man who has an earnest of the saving power of Jesus in his own heart and life is fully prepared by a blessed experimental knowledge to vindicate the Christship of the holy Jesus. In this warfare for the honor of our Saviour let every lawful weapon of defence be employed by the believing young and old, learned and unlearned, high and low; for to every one is furnished a sufficiency, an abundant supply, which gratitude, owing to God's response to our needs, should prompt us not to hide or rest unused.

Obs. 2. In considering the Person of Christ, we take the position, so often insisted on in this work, that Jesus is not to be regarded as a Personage separate and distinct *from* the Divine Plan. Thus e.g. if He is called "the Son of Man," instead of at once concluding that this is a phrase expressive of "humility," let it be contemplated in its relationship to this Kingdom (Props. 81, 82, 83, etc.), and its *Messianic dignity* will appear. When He is claimed to be a descendant of David, then, instead of putting

this aside as of minor consequence, let *the covenanted necessity* of His truly being such be duly weighed (Props. 49, 53, 122, etc.) and an important link *in* the Christship is presented. If He is "the Son of God," then, instead of receiving this as an honorary title, or one to indicate simple nearness to God, let it be examined in its unison with *the covenanted Theocratic idea and intention* (Props. 200, 204, etc.), and at once David's Son and David's Lord is exhibited before us. When it is said additionally that He is the "only-begotten Son" (John 3 : 16), it is not that He enjoys merely a sort of pre-eminence in Sonship, but it arises from the fact that He is the *only Theocratic King* that was predicted, and that ever shall in the future exist upon this earth. Hence we insist that Jesus the Christ must, if we will do justice both to the Record and to His Person, be considered *in His Theocratic relationship.* He is the promised Theocratic King, and as such His claims to our acceptance must be impartially investigated. But how is this to be done? Certainly not by scrutinizing His Person and claims *isolated and disconnected* from the Divine Plan which professes to introduce Him as the One just suited to carry out the same to the intended end. We take the covenants and the promises based upon them, and in the light of these we contrast Jesus in order to ascertain whether *He is indeed the Person* presented by them, and whether *He is able* to fulfil them. Thus to illustrate : one of the distinguishing peculiarities of this promised Messiah is the implied and apparent *immortality* attributed unto Him, so that the Jews themselves believed and asserted (John 12 : 34) that He would never die. How this was secured by His resurrection we have seen. The Theocratic ordering *necessitates* the same, and therefore it is not lacking in the Theocratic King. Again : the Messiah that is covenanted to rule over the Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom is to be possessed with *God-like powers* in order to bring in the predicted Millennial blessings, and this was so clearly apprehended by the Jews that they looked (John 7 : 31 ; Matt. 12 : 23) for Him to perform uncommonly great miracles. We have shown how, in the nature of the case, the miraculous or Supernatural must be, in order to identify Him as the true Theocratic King, connected with Jesus. If He is the Messiah at all, He must exhibit *the earnest*, at least, of Messianic power so that we may have confidence in Him and in His ability to consummate the predicted Messianic times. This too is identified with Jesus, and that, which so many object to as derogatory to Him, we find to be *indispensable* in the revealing of *Christship* (as Jesus asserts e.g. John 5 : 36). If Jesus is really the Theocratic King, then He must exhibit to us for recognition some of *the characteristics* of the same as foretold ; this, as every one admits, is done in the New Test., the only question being whether the account there given is sufficiently credible for our belief. No one disputes that the Christ of the New Test. tallies with the prophecies of the Old Test., but to avert the reception of this Messiah we are told by professed intelligence that these things are attributed to Jesus in order to make Him out to be the promised Christ i.e., it is "a cunningly devised fable." The men who tell us this also inform us that this was done by "ignorant persons," etc. We ask, which is the most reasonable, to receive their account as true because supported in all its details by the long preceded predictions of the Word, by the experience of a reception of the truth in our own hearts, by the continued fulfilment of Christ's Word, and by the necessities of man which it seeks to relieve, seeing that it is simply impossible for

learned men, much less "ignorant," to concoct a portraiture so perfect (and so far in advance even of Jewish conceptions) in Theocratic dignity, so confirmed by events that have continuously taken place to the present day, so admirably adapted to meet the requirements of the past, the present and the future, so skilfully adjusted to meet and supply the longings of the human heart as well as the groanings of creation, and so suited to the moral and higher nature of man that multitudes of the wisest and best of men have acknowledged it as supreme, or to reject their representations as false because "ignorant persons" were able to devise *the most complete* Theocratic model, to fit it into *a consecutive Plan* without a single flaw, and to develop *a Theocratic ordering* (the preparatives and final end) which above all that has ever yet been presented *meets in every particular* the evils under which nature and man are burdened, and proffers the very blessings which if realized will restore the golden age of longing humanity. The powerful reasons assigned by Steudel, Neander, Tholuck, Ullmann, Luthart, Ebrard, Ulhorn, Weiss, Christlieb, Oosterzee, Delitzsch, Auberlen, Birks, Schaff, McCosh, and others for the Christological position and nature of Jesus are strongly confirmed by the doctrine of this Kingdom, seeing that the Christship (Prop. 205) pervades, gives power, and is the heart of this Kingdom. So with the Messiahship, which is the equivalent of Christship, for, as Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 325) says: "The word Messiah grammatically signifies king." Messiah the Hebrew for Christ was universally understood by the Jews as descriptive of the King, but at present being regarded as "a doctrinal word" it is made to express, not the actual position, official station, and person of Jesus, but the works and blessings received from Him, thus obscuring the original and scriptural idea connected with it.[1] On the one hand, we object to the perversion of the name, applying it to something which merely results from the Messiahship, and, on the other, restricting (as Eckerman, *Theol. Beytr.* st. 1) the doctrine of the Messiahship only to the Jews and not as essential to pure Christianity. The latter is shown to be erroneous by the simple fact that believing Gentiles as well as Jews are to inherit the Messianic Kingdom; the former by the undoubted statements of the Word that salvation with all that it imports comes to us because this Jesus *is the Messiah*. The perversion and the restriction of the words "Christ" and "Messiah" do much *to darken* the testimony of the New Test. on this point. The Messiah is indeed the Saviour, the Redeemer, the Benefactor, etc., but let us never forget that He is such *because He is the Messiah*. Hence the special stress laid upon Peter's confession (Matt. 16 : 16, 17), because as Holy Writ plainly teaches, it is owing to His being "*the Christ*" that He has power to save, and that when the time comes for *the manifestation* of His glorious Messianic dignity, He will abundantly save and deliver His people, even taking them out of the now locked gates of Hades. *Now* we only receive the earnests or pledges of the same; *then* we shall realize the full meaning of that which faith and hope now only appropriates to the joy and peace of the heart. This brief digression is necessary to impress the following upon the reader's mind, viz. to comprehend the testimony of the New Test. concerning the nature and person of Jesus it is requisite always to retain the biblical conception of the words "*Christ*" and "*Messiah*." This, of course, always brings before us *the covenanted relationship of Jesus to the Theocratic Kingdom;* He is the Theocratic King, and because He is such He possesses the nature, power, etc., attributed to Him.

Therefore we repeat, owing to its importance, to do justice to "the Gospel of the Kingdom," witnesses and to Jesus Himself, we must first make ourselves fully acquainted with the Theocratic Kingdom, what it really is, and what it demands, and *then see whether Jesus meets the requirements of the Kingdom.* If such a comparison is instituted it will be found that (1) Jesus possesses all that the Theocratic ordering demands; and (2) that such a development in the Theocratic Plan—even taking the lowest ground, its simple portraiture exactly corresponding with the requirements of the case—was beyond human capacity.[2]

[1] Shortly after writing this a Prof. of Theology (Prof. Stuckenberg) called to see me. Asking him to define the word "Messiah," he most aptly replied: "It is *a Theocratic* word, representing the relationship of Jesus *to the Theocracy.*" As Jesus foreknew the non-establishment of the Theocracy through the non-repentance of the nation, the Messiahship was kept in the background and revealed only to a few, etc. The reader will observe that this reference to "the Christship" is introductory to a following Proposition (205) where the subject is continued.

[2] The attacks upon Jesus as "the Christ," simply endeavor to pick flaws here and there, but never consider His relationship to the Theocracy and His eminent fitness for it. Or else the entire claim of the Christship (without noticing its covenanted basis, its necessary prerequisites, its preparatory work, etc.) is dismissed in the most summary manner, as e.g. in *Freedom and Fellowship*, p. 254) it is said: "The time has come to see and to say that the Christian confession is not a truth, *Jesus was not the Christ of God.* The 'Christ' prophesied and longed for has never come, and will never come. The office and function is a mythical, an impossible one. No individual man has ever stood, or can ever stand, in the relation of Lord, King, and Saviour to the whole world. It would be *an infinite usurpation* for any man to occupy that office, either in a temporal or spiritual sense." (How this extract serves to illustrate the spirit noticed in Obs. 1!). This, indeed, would be "an infinite usurpation" if it were claimed by mere man; but our argument shows that such objections are based on an overlooking of *the Theocratic element* as once instituted, then incorporated with the human, and as finally manifested. Still the reader will observe that the admission is made that "*the infinite*" must be connected with "the Christ." How does it happen that "ignorant" men, separated by ages, draw out a Theocratic Plan and incorporate the "infinite" as *an essential factor* of the same—in brief, that which unbelief, wrongfully, urges as an objection. We "Bibliolaters" are accused of "ignorance," but our ignorance is founded on a view of the Divine Purpose taken as a whole, which necessitates as a preparatory Theocratic ordering the incarnation, divinity, resurrection, exaltation, and return of Jesus "the Christ."

But men (as predicted) will persistently close their eyes against *the facts* connected with the Christ as essential parts of a consecutive Divine Plan. They will even resort to the following, viz., parade several coincidences between Christ as given by the Gospels and the Hindu god Christna. Books are freely circulated calling special attention to the mythical stories of the Hindu gods (as Higgins's *Anacalypsis, The Masculine Cross*, etc.) and pressing them with *evident delight* (especially the latter work) against the claims of Jesus the Christ, declaring with assumption that the story of "the latter was copied from the earlier almost entire." Thousands, unable to discriminate, receive with relish a teaching that seems to release them from moral and religious obligations. Such things, however, only confirm us in the veracity of God's Word, which forewarns us against such efforts, teaching us that men will arise and endeavor to break the force of Christ's mission, etc., by employing subtle means calculated to entrap the unwary. To the strong in faith, the spirit and malignancy pervading them is sufficient for their rejection, but to the weak and the worldling they commend themselves because fitted to the natural outgrowth of human nature. It may be added: it certainly is attributing a profound knowledge of Oriental religions to "the ignorant" evangelists and apostles to make them "servile copyists," and to adduce Paul as "transforming the old cloak of Christna into the new mantle of Christ" (basing it upon 1 Cor. 4 : 10 and Rom. 3 : 7), rises nearly to the sublimity of audacity. It undoubtedly evinces great ignorance in the writings of both Scripture and Jewish literature.

Obs. 3. Let the reader exercise patience while we necessarily repeat a few facts which must be noticed in order to form an opinion whether "ignorant men" were able to produce such a portraiture of the Theocratic King.

Notice (1) the expressed determination of God to set up a Theocratic Kingdom given by the prophets in the ages preceding the First Advent; (2) this Theocratic Kingdom established in an initiatory form (some of its adjuncts being merely provisionary); (3) this Theocracy incorporates the Davidic line, thus more closely in its Headship allying itself with humanity; (4) when this incorporation takes place, it is declared by covenant and promise that this Theocratic Kingdom shall be established in a permanent and most glorious form under a descendant of David; (5) this Theocratic Kingdom under David and his immediate successors never gains a world ascendency but, on account of the sinfulness of kings and nations, is overthrown; (6) the Jewish nation being the covenanted people and the nucleus, owing to covenant relationship in and through whom the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom can only be manifested, that nation is still preserved; (7) the prophets, notwithstanding the downfall of the Kingdom still continue to predict the fulfilment of covenant and promise in the person of a descendant of David at some time in the future, and these predictions involve the restoration of the identical throne and Kingdom overthrown; (8) this predicted and covenanted Kingdom is preached and tendered to the Jewish nation, when the promised David's Son comes by the forerunner John, by the Son Himself and by His disciples, but only conditionally, viz., on repentance; (9) this Kingdom, owing to the condition enjoined not being complied with, is then postponed to a future Advent of this Son; (10) during this intercallary period (*a*) the tabernacle of David continues in ruins, (*b*) the Jewish nation is to be subjected to continued and fearful rejection and a scattering among the nations, (*c*) Gentile domination is to remain until a certain time has elapsed, (*d*) a Christian Church is to be established and perpetuated to raise up a seed unto Abraham and prepare for the manifestation of the Kingdom with a moral power and grandeur perfectly overwhelming; (11) this Kingdom is always spoken of as still future and identified with the period of the Sec. Advent; (12) and in this Kingdom, as realized at the Sec. Advent, the covenant and prophecies are said to be fulfilled, as is seen e.g. in appropriating the descriptions given by these to the Messianic Kingdom which is to be revealed at the Coming again of this same Jesus. Now here is a *connected* series, an *unbroken* chain of facts (some fulfilled, others fulfilling, and others are yet to be fulfilled) without a single defect to mar the union. To contemplate Jesus *separated from these facts,* is to do violence to His highest claim, His Theocratic Kingship. But to consider Him in His relationship to these, immediately enforces His Messiahship. For the Apostles, with strong Jewish prejudices and dealing with the same in others, could not possibly have persuaded themselves and others that a *dead* Jesus, Son of David, could be the Messiah *unless* a strictly logical chain—inset with the jewels of the resurrection, ascension, and exaltation—showed them—as it does to us this day—that the Messiahship of Jesus is immeasurably augmented even by *the very postponement* of the Kingdom. Thus e.g. leaving the foretelling of the postponement of the Kingdom and of His own death, etc., who told them of the punishment to be inflicted upon the city of Jerusalem and Jewish nation (as seen to this day); who informed them of the establishment of the Church and of its trials, mixed nature, etc. (as seen to this time); who gave them various predictions that were verified in their own experience (and continue in that of believers to the present), and having such testimony (1) in the Theocratic Plan, (2) in personal experience and

observation, (3) in what transpired around them, (4) in the aim and intent of this intercallary period, they would indeed have been both hopelessly "ignorant" and debased, had *they not accepted* of the Christship of Jesus. The present time, which multitudes claim makes shipwreck of the Jewish Messianic hopes, is only *the strongest possible proof* of the correctness of the same, seeing that the power that could postpone the Kingdom, punish the Jewish nation for its denial of repentance and slaying of Jesus, and establish the Church to raise up children to Abraham is already truly manifested as a Messianic power. To refute us, let the unbeliever point out a single prediction of Jesus relating to the present dispensation down to this time that *has failed* to find its mate. Hence, what this Jesus said and performed, His life, death, and resurrection, His personal withdrawal for a period, and yet His presence with and care over believers, binds Him as *the covenanted Theocratic Messiah* to all that preceded and to all that is yet to follow. The sacred writers justly reason that the First Advent of Jesus is a great and necessary *preparatory* measure to insure His exalted Christship. To refute this, let unbelief show us the ignorance of these Apostles in believing that, e.g. the resurrection of Jesus, the gathering out of material for this future Kingdom, etc., would not materially enhance the Theocratic glory that is predicted; yea, let them point out a solitary imperfection which can in any possible way vitiate the exact fulfilment of covenant and promise; yea more, let them say whether any one of the attributes, claims, characteristics, etc., given to Jesus *could be omitted without lessening, if not seriously damaging, His Theocratic Kingship.* The disciples could not concoct such a Messiah, because the facts that we have arrayed show such a conditional tender of the Kingdom (which *was opposed to Jewish prejudice*, which looked for it unconditionally in virtue of covenant relationship); such a rebuking, rejection, and dispersion of the nation (which *no Jew* with the well-known national deep-rooted prepossessions could possibly present, as seen e.g. in the history of false Messiahs); such a postponement of the Kingdom and a turning to the Gentiles (which was *highly offensive* to Jewish pride and bias), that to credit this to be the work of Jews, unsupported by the aid and light they claimed, is *to violate the laws governing nature*, making men capable of doing that which is not in his nature to perform, and thus attributing to mere reason what is most unreasonable, viz., that heart, feeling, and affection had nothing to do with this delineation of the Messiah. Can it be that men of intelligence will persist in rejecting a Messiah on the ground that a few Jews foisted upon the world a story of one, when the improbability and impossibility of the same appears in the very outset, in the very nature of humanity, seeing that it is contrary to all experience, all history, to suppose that such Jews, *in opposition to their dearest hopes and highest anticipations* could portray this Messiah as so hostile to the nation, so opposed to the covenanted people, that He gives them up for a long time to the domination of their enemies. Hence the old view (originated by Celsus, now advocated by many, and one that will ultimately prevail introductory to Antichrist), that Jesus was a deceiver, or that the disciples were intentional deceivers, aside from other considerations, falls before the Divine Plan of the contemplated Kingdom, the purity and perfectness elicited in its development, and the fact that the manner of its ultimate introduction, based upon the temporary rejection of the Jewish nation and the calling of the Gentiles, is opposed to the natural outgrowth of a Jewish training and Jewish sympathies.

The student will not fail to notice how these writers delineate the qualifications of Jesus for this Theocratic position, such as being David's Son, as covenant demands ; the Son of God, imparting the highest and purest Theocratic element ; immortal, insuring continued government, etc. ; power, dignity, and honor, indicative of His ability and worthiness ; righteousness and unchangeableness, presenting His imperial will in accord with the Father's and the welfare of His subjects ; the attributes of the Godhead, giving stability, irresistible power, etc., to the Theocracy ; the Personal appearance, the grandeur of His throne, the splendor of His court, the riches of His capitol, the homage and praise tendered, etc., all of which not only serve to impress, but in the Theocratic ordering are elements of importance—and who does not see *how impossible* it is for "ignorant" men to present *such a portraiture*. It is not a slight concession made to the merits of this Christ-picture that men who have done much to injure Christ (as Strauss, Renan, Mills, etc.) still acknowledge *a peculiar grandeur* in the scriptural portrayal. The highest intelligence, whether the heart respond or not, must acknowledge *an incomparable* portrayal. Fiske (*Unseen World*, art. 4) in "the Christ of Dogma" indeed labors to show how the attributing of such characteristics of the divine to Jesus were developed historically, but this is done in *the most arbitrary* manner by discarding as interpolations, or as subsequent additions, all that refers to the divine. In his one-sidedness he elevates himself to the position of a judge to set aside every statement as non-apostolic which does not suit his theory ; and this is called "*criticism*."

Obs. 4. From this standpoint we are prepared to answer various objections urged by the hyrda-headed unbelief. Thus e g. recent writers (Renan, etc.), who profess an admiration for Jesus (which they do not feel), tell us in a circumlocutory manner that Jesus being enthusiastic, etc., became the victim *of self-deception*, thinking Himself to be the predicted One *until death* crushed all His visionary hopes. But *how* could He be deceived, who *before* His death, when the representative men of the nation secretly conspired to put Him to death, *plainly taught* the postponement of the Kingdom, His own death, and all the grand outlines pertaining to this dispensation in relation to Jew and Gentile, to the Church and world? *How* can we believe Him to be such *when we* behold the Church, Jerusalem, the Jewish nation, Gentile dominion, unbelief, etc., just as He predicted? *How* can He be such when the tender of the Kingdom was conditional, and as long as this conditionality was imposed He rather kept His Messiahship *in the background*, but when the restraint, self-adopted, was removed by the secret overt act of the chief rulers of the nation (viz., to put Him to death, thus rejecting the tender made), He in connection with His predicted death *also proclaimed* His Messiahship to be publicly vindicated at some future Advent? *How* can He be a deceiver, when raising up, according to promise, co-heirs for the Theocratic Kingdom, He exhibits the faithfulness of His Word by bestowing *the earnests* of that which is to come? The charge of self-deception springs from utterly ignoring the recorded fact that this Jesus, instead of being deceived at not being able to raise up the predicted Messianic Kingdom, Himself merely offered it *conditionally*, and when this offer was rejected in His contemplated and premeditated death, He Himself withdrew it, and *postponed* its establishment—as a punishment to the nation and as a mercy to Gentiles—to His Sec. Advent. This is also a sufficient answer to those who urge the same objection with the proviso that, finding Himself unable to set up the Kingdom originally intended, He then changed His plan, and endeavored to establish a kind of purely spiritual or moral Kingdom. Such objectors are very careful not to allow *the testimony* of the Record to appear which witnesses that the tender was *conditional*, that it was *withdrawn* in a certain contingency, and that instead of changing His plan He *postponed* its

execution until the period of His Sec. Coming, in the meanwhile arranging and ordering things to be ultimatively promotive of, and effectual in, the prosecution of *the postponed Purpose.* This also triumphantly meets the dishonoring explanation given by Bauer that the Messiahship arose from a developing process in His own mind ; for this is rebutted at once by the first preaching *of the Kingdom* by John the Baptist, etc., which shows *both* the relationship that the Messianic idea sustained to all that preceded, and that the Kingdom, which included of course the Messianic idea realized, was in the very beginning tendered in good faith to the Jewish nation *on condition* of repentance. There is no growth or gradual development here ; and, in addition, when the Kingdom is rejected and with it, of course, the Messiah, the Messianic idea *remains unchanged, the realization* of it being only postponed to the future Advent. It is passing strange that men, who constantly appeal to fairness and reason, will not allow reason to weigh with candor *the testimony* of Christ's witnesses. Again : this teaches us how to regard the view that in order to found another (spiritual) Kingdom, Jesus, in opposition to the Pharisees, cuts Himself loose " from all connection with the Theocracy" (so Shenkel, quoted by Christlieb, *Mod. Doubt.*, p. 374). Well may we ask, what Theocracy was then in existence, when even James (Acts 15 : 16) informs us that the Theocratic Kingdom was in ruins? The truth is, *none existed as none now exists,* although writers, against the meaning of the word (denoting God's condescending to act in the capacity of earthly ruler) now apply it to the Romish, Greek, and Protestant Churches. It was *the Theocratic Kingdom* that was offered to the Jews, because, owing to sin, it had been withdrawn from them, and when this tender was refused Jesus positively declared that *this Theocracy* should not be established until at His Sec. Advent. Again : this enables us to see how unwarranted Strauss (*Life of Jesus*, vol. 1, p. 520) is in asserting that Jesus at the First Advent hoped to restore the Davidic Kingdom by the Supernatural interference of God, and that the disciples had this idea of restoration " gives us a very small idea of their powers of comprehension." The answer is plain : the conditional tender of the Kingdom, and the repeated predictions of Jesus concerning its postponement, *amply sustain* the Messianic position of Jesus, and that He entertained no false hopes. As to the disciples, so long as the Kingdom was preached, and until they were fully enlightened to its postponement it would have been *derogatory* to their faith in the Kingdom, in the covenant and predictions, yea, in the Messiah Himself if they did not believe in the restored Davidic throne and Kingdom, that being *the only* Kingdom promised to David's Son. The lack of comprehension in this case is not in the disciples, but in unbelievers, who are blinded by its present non-establishment, which they parade as proof that it *never* will be. The conditionality attached to the offer of the Kingdom, its postponement, etc., also explains the refusal of Jesus to perform miraculous signs when solicited in attestation of His being " the Messiah" (Matt. 16 : 1, etc.), and which some of these writers assume as proof that the Messiahship was in a manner *forced* upon Jesus reluctantly by a chain of circumstances. The condition of *repentance* imposed does not require miraculous signs to establish its validity or enforce its obligation (and hence John the Baptist the special preacher of it, performs none), for it is based upon the recorded law of God and the responsive moral nature of man. Jesus having given *a sufficiency* to indicate His Supernatural endowments—such as necessarily belong to a

Messiah—it would, in view of *the foreseen* rejection, the *moral freedom* of the nation, and *the postponement* of the Kingdom, have been premature and ill-timed to have given unrepentant and unbelieving Jews the direct testimonies, as demanded, of Messiahship, for it would have ignored *the condition first of all imposed*, viz., repent. Had they repented the wonderful signs of Messiahship would have legitimately followed in the mighty work then undertaken, but unrepentant the Kingdom was no longer nigh, and they had no claim upon the Messiah. The refusal is therefore grounded upon *the moral relations* that the nation sustained to the Messiah. Again : the theory of "natural" explanation (Paulus, etc.), which endeavors to preserve a few fragments of the Gospels by eliminating the miraculous and Supernatural under the plea that we have an exaggerated statement which must be explained by natural causes, is (aside from its outrageous exegetical character) clearly shown to be untenable, because it vitiates the central idea of the Messianic conception, viz., that He only was a Messiah according to the prophetic and Jewish notion who had the Supernatural closely allied with, and really possessed by, Him. For no one else, it was correctly believed, could possibly introduce the mighty changes and blessings of the Messianic Kingdom. Hence to place any other construction upon the language of the New Test. than it plainly in its grammatical construction requires, in order to emasculate the marvellous, is simply to deny its Messianic belief, its Messianic Kingdom, its Theocratic King. For the veritable Christ of the promised Kingdom *must correspond* with the covenanted and predicted King, and hence the writers correctly represent the Supernatural as connected with the Person of this Messiah. It follows, therefore, that the most foolish and inconsistent of all attacks upon the Messiahship, is to explain the language intended to convey the notion of the miraculous to denote something else, because the removal of the Supernatural by this means has no affinity with *the design* of the Gospels, with *the ideas* then current, with *the prophetic word* that preceded, and with *the Kingdom of God* that was then universally believed.

The efforts made to separate the Christ of the Gospels from the Supernatural and miraculous by a host of past and present writers is simply *a historical and dlogical outrage*, seeing (1) that the latter is so connected and interwoven with all that pertains to Jesus (in birth, life, death, etc.) that it cannot be separated from Him without *the greatest violence;* (2) that such a separation can only be effected at *a fearful sacrifice* of Christ's character, claims, designs etc. ; (3) that it virtually makes—no matter what eulogies are given to soften it—Jesus the Christ *a deceiver and impostor;* (4) that it utterly destroys *the veracity and authority* of "the Christ," leaving us simply a man with noble but mistaken aspirations, who by the force of his mind and the things inculcated, aided by circumstances, worked a religious revolution in society ; (5) that it leaves us *a mere caricature* of the scriptural Christ, for whose teaching, actions, and claims we are constantly to apologize, making them either an accommodation to the spirit of the age, or a remnant of superstition, or a misrepresentation of the evangelists, etc. This, too, is done *most offensively*, without the least regard to the feelings or religious sentiments of others. We append several illustrations : The *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, March 13th, 1875, in the art. "The Christ Question," the writer refers to the outrageous work of Tuttle's, "The Career of the Christ-Idea in History," which makes Jesus a mere man subject to imperfection, superstition, error, delusions, etc., common to all men, and indorsing Peebles as saying : "The accepted Saviour of Christian nations is the theologic Christ—a strange Hebraic hybrid, half-god and half-man ; a Church monster, shapen by the old ecclesiastic fathers and Roman bishops from the most worthless portions of the cast-off drippings of pagan traditions." Here is certainly exhibited *hatred and malice* instead of lauded reason and regard for logical consistency. In the same journal for 1875 is presented a series of articles by Scott on the "Fall and Redemption of Man," which accounts for what are received as facts in the Gospels by making them representative of

astronomical occurrences. It is a re-hash of Mackay's work *The Progress of the Intellect, as Exemplified in the Religious Development of the Greeks and Romans*, and both are probably largely indebted to a French work by Dupuis. The absurdity, and the constant drain on the imagination, make them utterly unworthy of a serious reply. (Comp. art. "On Forms of Infidelity in the Nineteenth Century" in the *North Brit. Review*, May, 1851, and the scathing rebuke administered to such views by Priestley in his *Comparison of the Institution of Moses with those of the Hindoos and Other Ancient Nations*, with remarks on Dupuis's *Origin of Religions*.) Hundreds of recent works, periodicals like the *Truth-Seeker*, *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, *Evolution*, and others contain the lowest possible estimate of Jesus Christ, and the "animus" in which much is written clearly indicates that it is more the work of *the heart* (objecting to His moral restraints) than that of *reason*.

Obs. 5. Let us continue to notice other objections varying some in form from these, and also intended to lower, if possible, the Messianic character; for such mention of them is the more important since there is no doubt but in the coming struggle with unbelief, preparing the way for Antichrist's revelation, *all such objections* will be more persistently urged against Christ. It is well to observe the weapons of our enemies that are, and will be, employed against Christ, in order to ascertain what to oppose to them. Thus e.g. the view is prevalent in some quarters that the Messianic conception of Jesus, the result of a vivid Oriental imagination, forms *an ideal* that is in accord with prophetic utterances, and which, however impracticable, by the grandeur of its fancy elevates Jesus into one of those great harmless dreamers of fiction, who exert a good influence over the minds and hearts of others. The Messianic idea is discarded as *a reality* and retained as *ideal*, the play of exuberant fancy. Let us ask, was the preaching of the Kingdom tendered on condition of repentance imaginary? Was the postponement of the Kingdom attested to by the terrible downfall of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the nation mere imagination? Is the establishment of the Church under persecution, the belief so humiliating to Jewish prejudice, the union of suffering and death to bring forth in perfection the Messianic completeness, all fancy? Surely in considering the Theocratic ordering in its entirety, and seeing *how* the Theocratic King is made perfect through suffering, *how* the Messianic claims are attested to by the greatest of historical realities, the fancy belongs to the objectors. Again: to depreciate the Christ, it has been represented that He takes no interest in science, art, trade, social amenities, etc., and therefore is One who took a contracted view of man's condition. But the objector overlooks the fact that *the design* of the New Test. is merely to present "the Gospel of the Kingdom," to show how the Messiah came, how the Kingdom was tendered and refused, how it was postponed, and how provision is made for its future establishment. In doing this the briefest incidental mention, only sufficient to preserve the requisite connection, is made of the retired life of Jesus, and He is at once brought before us as "the Christ." It is taken for granted that the greater blessing, viz., that of the Kingdom, includes all the lesser, as is seen in the beautiful prophecies respecting this Kingdom introducing *the highest* civil and social enjoyments, the universal spread of knowledge and the peaceful pursuits of the avocations of life. The great subject is the theme, and hence we have only incidentally brought in Christ's appreciation of nature and beauty (as in the lily) or His enjoyment and encouragement of social life (as in the wedding party), etc., because all these things are swallowed up in the Messianic idea, which in itself *embraces all that is essential* to man's future development and happiness.

Again : we are told that the Gospel narratives respecting the Christ were concocted in their present form by post-apostolic writers, and that, in view of this, the portraiture of the Messiah must be received with much allowance for interpolation, error, exaggeration, etc. Passing by the important concessions of the later Bauer school, and the numerous testimonies which refute this, it is sufficient to point out the simple fact that, when looking at the connected doctrine of the Kingdom and the exact correspondence of all that pertains to the Messiah with it, the postponement of such a Record to the substituted later age *is an impossibility*. Because the simple narration of facts leaving the deduction of doctrine from them (grounded upon the notion that the reader has a previous acquaintance with covenant and prophecy), is utterly opposed to *the spirit* of a succeeding period, which would have interlarded such a production with substitutions, inferences, doctrinal exhibitions, laudatory expressions, etc., which would *inevitably* have betrayed its later origin. The faithful portraiture of the Messiah, perfectly agreeing with the Old Test. Scriptures and with the views of the Apostolic Church, is an ample refutation of this theory. Even such incidents as Christ's refusal to perform miracles to prove, on demand, His Messianic character, could not have been inserted at a later age, for under the notion of exalting Him the connection which this refusal sustains to the conditionality of the tender of the Kingdom would have been overlooked (as proven by what really occurred in later writings). Again : the resurrection of Jesus is denied on two grounds : (1) that the Kingdom not appearing, a resurrection was added (so Renan, etc.) in order to substitute a spiritual Kingdom and a spiritual Christ ; and (2) that if Jesus rose from the dead as recorded "why (so Schenkel, *Sketch of Jesus*, etc.) did He not show Himself to His Jewish judges and to the Roman Procurator? Why did He not appear in the streets of Jerusalem before the people who had been so basely deceived as to His Person? Why did He not by His mere appearance inspire courage in His frightened followers everywhere, and utterly defeat His malignant enemies?" Such objections entirely overlook *the facts* pertaining to the Kingdom. As to the first, the *postponement* of the Kingdom was proclaimed in connection with the foretold death and resurrection, and no substitution of a spiritual Kingdom, as multitudes dream, was made, as is firmly proven by *the universal doctrinal position* of the Church for the first three centuries. All believers immediately after the resurrection continued, as the promises positively required, to look for *the identical Kingdom* which they believed in *before His death*, only locating its establishment *at the Sec. Advent*. The spiritual Kingdom that these men talk about is the outgrowth of *a later, spiritualistic system* of interpretation. Besides this, the resurrection, as we have shown, is an important *pre-requisite* to secure the reorganization of the Davidic Kingdom upon that unchangeable Messianic basis predicted. The resurrection makes no change in the Kingdom, but *pre-eminently qualifies* the King to bring it, when re-established, to its promised height of permanency and glory. Indeed, it is an *essential factor* in its re-establishment in the form covenanted and promised, elevating David's Son into the Immortal Son who can reign as long as the sun and moon endures, and affording unto us *the pledge* of His Messianic power to fulfil the promises to the Fathers and all believing ones in raising them also from the dead, and causing them to inherit His Theocratic Kingdom when revealed. Any theory which refuses to receive the resurrection *just as related* in the New Test. (making it a

resurrection of mere spirit as Shenkel ; or a historical account of no practical importance in the development of Christian faith, as Keim ; or an event that is to be explained by apparent death, as Schleiermacher ; or a harmless deception, as Renan ; or a gross falsehood, as Bardht), fails to see its *essential connection* with the Kingdom, and its *necessary existence* in order, at the appointed time, to fulfil the promises of God. Men like Strauss inform us that they want two proofs in confirmation of the resurrection of Jesus, viz., that the reality of it shall be vindicated by observing all the conditions of historical testimonies ; and that, unless this resurrection took place, other events now historically certain could not have transpired. The doctrine of the Kingdom affords those evidences, and thus establishes the Messiahship of Jesus, for it shows us that the direct testimony given by the professed witnesses to the fact are sustained by requisite *historical connection* both with what preceded and what is to follow. The testimony is *in perfect correspondence* with the requirements of the Kingdom ; and, therefore, in the consideration of this subject, it is only just to weigh the credibility of the witnesses (who profess to testify to the filling out of a Divine Plan) *in the light* of that history which God has produced and contemplates yet to introduce. In other words : the resurrection being part of the Divine Plan in reference to this Kingdom, the fundamental inquiry ought to be whether it is *fully adapted* to secure the end intended, and whether in the prosecution of such an end it *re-confirms* past history. The answer to this vindicates the testimony of the disciples, the absolute necessity of the resurrection, and the cordial reception of it as *a glorious earnest* of the power of the Coming Kingdom. If it be asked what events that certainly took place are developed by, or connected with, the resurrection, the definite response comes again, such as : the continued belief in the Messiahship of Jesus over against the Jewish prejudice immediately suggested by a crucified One ; the establishment of the Church in the manner predicted before His death, by making Peter the one who holds the keys of knowledge to show that there is still forgiveness to the Jew, who cruelly rejected the Messiah, and that the Gentile can be engrafted on the principle of faith ; the perpetuity of this Church with its belief in the resurrection of Jesus as a cardinal point ; the institution of the Lord's Supper before His death and its perpetuation after the death, but celebrated as a memorial of triumph over death ; the treading down of Jerusalem, the continued dispersion of the Jewish nation, the Gentile dominion, the rising up of the apostasy, persecution, etc., considered as depending for their fulfilment upon the previously given word of a crucified and resurrected Jesus. Christlieb has well shown (*Mod. Doubt*) that the conversion and history of St. Paul *alone* answers Strauss's objection. As to the second explanation asked, why the resurrected Jesus did not appear before the Jewish judges to confound them, etc., *the least acquaintance* with the doctrine of the Kingdom presents us readily with the reason. The Kingdom having been conditionally offered to the nation and having been rejected because the nation remained unrepentant, it was postponed until the Sec. Advent, and therefore, in view of the Divine Purpose previously plainly announced before His death, and thus embracing also a punishment upon the unbelief of the nation, it would *have been incompatible with Messianic dignity and purpose* to exhibit Himself to any others than believers in Him. His enemies were to drink the allotted cup ; His friends were to be sustained by the earnests of faith in His resurrection ; all were to receive

the sufficiency of evidence *consistent* with moral freedom, with His own honor, with the predicted withdrawal, and with an incorporated repentance and faith. If the objection has any force, then Jesus ought thus to prove His resurrection to every unbeliever in the world, which leaves no ground for the kind of repentance and faith that the New Test. requires of us.

Multitudes (as Fowle in *Science and Immortality*) reject the resurrection, no matter what proof is presented, simply because it introduces *the Supernatural element*, which is antagonistic to their idea of unchangeable laws of nature. This notion has spread widely even in the Church, and men who profess to believe in Christ (but know but little of what constitutes a Christ) entertain it. Thus e.g. Dr. Macleod (*Memoirs*, vol. 2, p. 371) says : "I have been astounded by a most influential member of the Church saying to me, 'What is it to me whether Christ worked miracles or rose from the dead? We have got the right' idea of God through Him. It is enough ; that can never perish!' And this truth is like a flower, which has grown from a dunghill of lies and myths! Good Lord, deliver me from such conclusions! If the battle has come, let it ; but before God I will fight it with those only, be they few or many, who believe in a risen, living Saviour. This revelation of the influence of surface criticism has thrown me back immensely upon all who hold fast by an objective revelation." The fact is, that unbelief which acknowledges the Divinity of Jesus as recorded, and on this ground rejects Him, is *more consistent* than such a faith which receives a Saviour, shorn of the attributes that constitute Him the Redeemer.

Obs. 6. Objections the most opposite, indicative of *the heart's desire* in the matter, are urged to diminish indirectly or directly the Christship of Jesus. Thus e.g. one tells us (as Bauer) that the world was prepared to receive the Messianic idea, and that Christianity is the natural outgrowth of the ideas then prevalent. But this *is opposed* by the postponement of the Kingdom owing to its not being prepared, by the rejection of Jesus, by the persecution of His followers, and by the hatred of the world both Jewish and Gentile. In confirmation, however, of the world's preparation we are additionally informed that Christianity is Judaism spiritualized by means of the allegorical interpretation of the Old Test. introduced by the religious philosophy of the Alexandrian school. But if such is the case, why did not the Church then during the first centuries *thus spiritualize away* the Messiah and the Kingdom ; and why did not those Jews addicted to such allegory *become Christians?* The truth is, that the spiritualizing which tampered with the Messianic idea and the Messianic Kingdom came in later through such men as Origen, etc. ; for history records the fact that both of these fundamental ideas were preserved intact by the early believers. Jesus does not yield up His Messiahship, as including His claim to the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, to be a moral Reformer of Judaism ; this is seen in the postponement, etc., of the Kingdom, and in the belief of the primitive churches. As Apologists have remarked, there is no historical evidence, even the slightest, to prove that the allegorical interpretation of Alexandrian Jews had any influence whatever in forming the primitive views pertaining to the Christ ; but, on the other hand, the reception of the Old Test. Scriptures, the retention of the pure Messianic conception, the utterance of various predictions, etc., all to be taken in their proper grammatical meaning, show that the allegorical interpretation met with *no favor* in the teaching of Jesus or His disciples. Even when allegory is admissible it is confined to the subject in hand and does not vitiate or alter (as seen in Paul) the proper, legitimate covenanted Messiahship and Messianic Kingdom. Again : the apprehension of the Kingdom meets and repels the strange, yet oft-repeated statement, that the establishment of the Ch.

Church is the result of a weak belief in a Galilean Rabbi. Aside from the usual effective replies given by Apologists and reasons already assigned, it is sufficient to add that the establishment of the Ch. Church is explained in the New Test. to be *a positive necessity* in order, while the elect Jewish nation is for a determined time held in abeyance, that a seed may be gathered out to Abraham, and an unbroken line of election be continued. It is a carrying out of the Divine Purpose in preparing a people for the incoming Kingdom ; and the work specifically assigned to the Church has, more or less, been carried on to the present. The attacks upon the founding of the Church thus overlook *the connection* that the Church necessarily sustains to the Divine Plan, to the postponement of the Kingdom and temporary rejection of the Jewish nation, and finally to the preparation that it includes for the Messianic Kingdom. (Comp. Props. 86, 87, 88, etc.). In addition, the same regard paid to the things pertaining to the Kingdom shows us that when men (as Bauer) attempt to derive the call of the Gentiles and a "Universalism," as suggested by the state of the Roman Empire and this confirmed and made effectual by a divergence of Paul, over against Peter, in this direction—they simply ignore *the testimony* that is given upon these points. They overlook *the connection* that this call of the Gentiles sustains to the postponed Kingdom, to the rejected nation, to the Theocratic Kingdom, to the foretold (even already by Moses) anger of God abiding upon the Jewish nation influencing Him to call out from among the nations a people for His name ; and they press this "universalism" to the extent that the Jewish nation is no longer in covenanted relationship with God (thus breaking God's oath-attested covenant, and making Him with His foreknowledge to have been mistaken in His Plans), and it can never, any more than the Gentiles, expect any special favor (thus erasing many precious prophecies pertaining to the future restoration and glory of this nation, and blessings flowing to the Gentiles through it). And, instead of allowing the Record *to testify*, as it does, that Peter was the first one who, under divine guidance, extended the call to the Gentiles, they endeavor (against renewed testimony to the contrary) to develop an antagonism between Peter and Paul, making the former "contracted" and the latter "liberal" in his views. Such efforts which seek in these indirect ways to disparage the Messianic idea of the New Test., are unavoidably weak in the estimation of even the uneducated believer, because he sees at once that to make out such an account no attention whatever is paid either to the plan of procedure, or to the part that was really taken in this call by those commissioned to extend it.

Beal, Graves, and others, to rid themselves of New Test. obligations, show that other professed sacred writings and heathen mythology also taught an incarnation. But they are very careful not to mention *the immense contrast* between such and the New Test. doctrine, and that they do not stand related to a definite developed Theocratic Plan ; for they only serve to show how a deep latent feeling for some such union with Deity is expressed as a longing even by the heathen. The sublime acts, life, etc., connected with Jesus are not found in such alleged incarnations, and a continuous fulfilment of prediction and preparative measures are totally lacking in them. Many of the destructive works indeed scout (as e.g. *The Jesus of History*) the idea that Jesus predicted with such definiteness His own death and resurrection (making such an after attachment), but they cannot rid themselves of the other predictions fulfilled continuously down to the present time.

Obs. 7. Seeing how largely the Sec. Advent of Jesus is adapted both to explain with consistency what otherwise would be inexplicable (for, it

teaches us how the covenant and promises can be realized), and to substantiate the Theocratic position of Jesus (for He that can thus come again as promised must be more than mere man), unbelievers have ever been hostile to it, and denunciatory of it. The lowest form of attack is to pronounce it "an exploded myth" or "a base fabrication." Strauss has no hesitancy in saying (*Life of Christ*, p. 242) that when Jesus spoke of the power and glory connected with His Sec. Coming, He appears "not only as an enthusiast," but as "guilty of undue self-exaltation." In other words, the Saviour is convicted of uttering falsehoods, and the charge is repeated in all its varied changes, now more indirectly and then more directly, by all who reject the Christship of Jesus. It is a doctrine *so self-condemning, so humiliating* to them that they become *offended* at it, as Strauss candidly confesses (p. 242): "What *offends us* in all these discourses is only the one point, that Christ should have attached that miraculous change, the appearance of that ideal day of retribution, to His own person, and that He should have designated Himself as the Judge who would come in the clouds of heaven, accompanied by angels, to raise the dead and judge the world. The man who expects such things of Himself is not only an enthusiast (or visionary), he is guilty of undue self-exaltation in presuming to except Himself from all others so far as to place Himself above them as their future Judge." Yes! this writer is perfectly consistent when he takes the position that *no mere man* can assert such things of himself. Others, who still strive to bring forth adulterated admiration for Jesus, and to save the reputation of the Holy One, tell us (as Shenkel, *Sketch of Jesus*, p. 104 and 108) that His Sec. Advent is to be taken impersonally or figuratively and that the disciples *not comprehending the figure* made it a personal Advent. This is based upon two suppositions, (1) that it is impossible that Christ should predict such a personal Advent with outward glory, etc., to set up an earthly kingdom; and (2) that coming to found *a spiritual* Kingdom, He could not possibly have enumerated that outward splendor, etc., as associated with a personal Advent, because a spiritual Kingdom is opposed to the idea. First in reply to Shenkel's class: How do they know that when Christ postponed His Kingdom to this Sec. Advent (as specifically stated by Himself, see Prop. 58, etc.) that He also set up another? (Comp. Props. 56–104). *Where* is the proof of this premise? The deduction is false, because no such well-founded premise exists. For there is only *one covenanted Kingdom* promised to David's Son here on the earth, and that is the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom now still withdrawn and overturned as Bible and history testify. *How* do they know that Christ's Kingdom is a purely "earthly" one, and that it would be derogatory to His dignity and to angelic precedency to come, as grammatically expressed, to inaugurate such a Kingdom? Here again a premise is taken for granted, and erroneous inferences derived from it. The Theocratic Kingdom (once instituted, which perhaps is also to these men impersonal although historical, with great outward manifestations) is no mere earthly Kingdom (and it is anti-biblical thus to call it), seeing that God Himself as the self-constituted earthly Ruler is the Head. Hence it is "the Kingdom of God," etc., Prop. 45. The non-comprehension of the Kingdom, and the introduction of an imaginary one forms the ground of the forced explanation which does positive violence to the language of Jesus (because leaving the plain grammatical meaning so highly indicative of personality (Prop. 22, 23). The most reasonable thing in the world, if once the pro-

phetic and covenanted idea of the Messianic Kingdom is retained, is that, when the Theocratic Kingdom is restored under David's Son and Lord, the greatness and majesty of the King should bring forth, as Jesus testifies, a splendor and glory far exceeding anything that the world has ever witnessed, or that we can imagine. Therefore Christlieb (although retaining the notion of an invisible spiritual Kingdom) says in answer to Shenkel (*Mod. Doubt*, p. 367) : " We ask in amazement, Has the idea never dawned upon Dr. Shenkel, that ' corporality is the end of God's ways ' and must be so?" and argues that the visible, outward appearance of the Kingdom is essential to its triumph. We reason step by step, and each one firmly established upon a scriptural basis as seen in the preceding Propositions, that if ever the Theocratic Kingdom is restored, it must, *in the very nature of the case*, have an external, outward manifestation ; and having for its Ruler David's glorified Son, and for associated rulers Christ's glorified brethren, *it must exhibit* a splendor and glory most striking and overwhelming. The Personality of the Sec. Advent (substantiated under several Props.) is *a necessary part* of the covenanted Kingdom, for the Kingdom being postponed to this Advent, it is impossible to conceive how it can be re-established without His Coming and interference, or how a Son of Man, a real David's Son, can rule in a restored David's throne and Kingdom, as predicted, without being personally present, just as the disciples believed, who heard these declarations fall from the lips of Jesus, and after His resurrection conversed with Him forty days (Acts 1 : 3), " *speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.*" We believe that these disciples knew *more accurately*, owing to their facilities and that the subject was made a speciality, the things pertaining to the Kingdom than any men that have lived since their day. Let us add : that to change the meaning of Christ's language, thus destroying its affinity to what is absolutely requisite to carry out the Divine Purpose, and in doing this to bring discredit and dishonor upon the men who preached this Theocratic Kingdom, is not a whit *less dishonorable* than to pronounce the whole matter a visionary notion. Second, in reply to both Strauss and Shenkel, the doctrine of the Sec. Advent must not be considered *isolated, detached* from its connection with the Kingdom and a continuous Divine Plan to be consummated in the Kingdom. Our likes or dislikes have nothing to do with it ; the question is whether such an Advent, as incorporated in the Plan, is *eminently adapted and even necessary* to produce the result foretold. And in deciding this the student will not overlook *how* this Advent naturally follows from the postponement of the Kingdom and the rejection and withdrawal of Jesus ; from the intercallary period occupied in gathering out a people to inherit the Kingdom ; from its having been foretold centuries before Jesus declared it ; from the impossibility of the disciples with their Jewish expectations of immediate re-establishment of the Kingdom receiving such a doctrine without the assurances presented which they claim. Let the unbiassed reader take the doctrine of the Kingdom and trace it through its phases, and see for himself how the Sec. Advent grows out of it as *an indispensable factor* in the furtherance of the Kingdom, and that it is the only thing revealed by which the Theocratic Kingdom can possibly be brought again into existence, and he will see that it would have been *unreasonable* upon the part of those who were witnesses of Jesus, of His power and resurrection, not to have accepted of it, and not to have expressed it as *the grand instrumentality* through which the promises were to

be realized. The objection urged that such a doctrine is incompatible with the limitations of a mere man has no force until it be shown that Jesus *is only* a man, but, on the other hand, if He is more than man the doctrine is eminently worthy of him—in fact, is just such an one as, under the circumstances, must pertain to Him. Leaving the divinity of Christ (see below), it is sufficient to say that the Sec. Advent of Jesus, which, if received, at once establishes that Jesus is also divine, is rejected by these men because, if accepted, it imposes *the condition of accountability* to Him, and enforces the authority of scriptural demands upon the heart and life, and this a worldly, fleshly heart cannot entertain. Hence they care not to regard it from higher ground ; its necessity and connection with the past, present, and future ; its Theocratic aspect and identification with the Messianic idea, and its adaptedness to bring forth the fulfilment of covenant and promise. And, we protest against the injustice, so far as the Record is concerned, of judging the Messianic claims of Jesus by confining them to the First Advent and not including the Second. For, this is taking *a narrow contracted* view of the subject, and doing positive violence to Holy Writ, seeing that the Messianic idea in its realization is pointedly deferred —owing to sinfulness, etc.—to this Sec. Coming. Therefore to form a correct judgment whether it can be verified, the Sec. Advent must be contemplated as *a means toward a foretold end.* Here we take our position ; if unbelief can point out a single defect in the Sec. Advent that will indicate directly or indirectly the impossibility of realizing the covenanted Messianic idea, then truly a serious and valid objection is raised up against us. Until this is done we are only too happy to follow in the steps of the primitive Church, and to hold that the Messianic conception is only realized in the Messianic Kingdom which is to be established at the Sec. Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ ; believing too that it is utterly beyond the capacity of "ignorant and unlearned" men to introduce and develop so perfect and majestic *an adaptation* to an end which purposes the most glorious and desirable redemption.

The writer may be allowed to add : the great defect of systems of Theology for centuries has been the following : they have laid too much stress on provisional redemption and not on redemption itself as realized at the Sec. Advent in "the day of Christ." Thus the mysterious sacrifice, exceedingly precious by which redemption is procured and assured is deemed the only great and central point in Theology, while the completion of redemption is merely secondary to that of the means. This blemish in many works which reflects upon the Christship of Jesus ought to be removed. A little reflection teaches this : if that sacrifice alone is sufficient to secure our salvation, how comes it that it does not save from temporal death, from temporal evil, corruption, etc., and that it becomes absolutely necessary for Jesus the Christ to come again to salvation in behalf of those who honor His sacrifice. Something then *additional* to that sacrifice is needed, viz., the personal interference of the Saviour in our behalf. The sacrifice made by Him enables Him to do this, constituting Him, in view of its acceptance by the Father, a perfect Redeemer, and enabling Him in accord with right, because of its acceptance by us, to exert His power and Christship in our interests. If this be so that something must be superadded, when the time arrives, to the sacrifice to secure what faith and hope in the sacrifice sees and desires, why refuse to recognize distinctly, as the Bible does, that the Redeemer to perfect His own work must come again "the second time unto salvation" ? The prevailing view makes that Second Coming a minor point, a comparative insignificant matter (alas ! some even who profess to be ministers of "the Christ" proclaim it "an exploded doctrine"), exalts the means, the preparatory work above "the Christship" of the future, and painfully evidences its lack of faith in salvation obtained under Theocratic auspices.

Obs. 8. Now we come briefly to consider the great stumbling block in

the way of all unbelief to the acceptance of the Messianic idea, viz., that of *the Divinity* of this Son of Man. Unbelief correctly asserts that what the New Test. declares of this Jesus cannot possibly be applied to a mere man; unbelief sees and acknowledges that the attributing to Him the power of forgiving sins, of judging the world, of raising the dead, of assigning rewards and punishments, as well as in the bestowal upon Him of titles, worship, honor, and glory that belong to God, is *utterly incompatible* with mere humanity. This confession, as far as it goes, is worthy of notice, and is a deserving rebuke to some professed believers who, under the influence of theory, endeavor to lessen the divine in the Master. In the consideration of so fundamental a point, upon which depends so much in the past and future history of the race, and around which cluster the dearest hopes of an evil burdened humanity, we should approach it with the resolve to allow *the full force of all the proof* given in its behalf to be candidly weighed. Passing by that which has been ably presented by Apologists, we confine ourselves only to that derived from the doctrine of the Kingdom, feeling assured that this is ample enough to stamp Jesus as God-Man. Let the student reflect upon the nature of this Theocratic Kingdom and he will see that, *as covenanted and predicted*, it *necessarily* includes as its promised King *a God-man*. Turn back to the ancient predictions (allowed even by unbelief to be such) respecting this Theocratic King and notice what He is to perform (e.g. to raise the dead, remove the curse, etc.), and reason at once decides that *no mere man* can be such a mighty King. Consider that the Theocracy in its direct meaning includes as *its central conception* that of *God Himself* acting as an earthly Ruler, and that the biblical portrayed purpose is to manifest this through the Davidic line *in the Person* of Jesus, and it follows that if *God* rules in and through Jesus, the Son of David, He must be in some way *fully and closely identified* with Jesus. The Theocratic idea is exhibited in the Person of Jesus, and hence the statements: "*I and my Father are One; I am in the Father and the Father in Me*" (John 10 : 30, etc.), "*He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father,*" etc., which assume *definitely that He is the Theocratic King in its highest sense*, viz., in the identical one inaugurated at Mt. Sinai, when it was justly believed that *God Himself* was the King of the instituted Kingdom. This is repeated when He, from the depth of His Theocratic consciousness, declares "*that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father*" (John 5 : 23) etc. Being thus the Person in whom the Theocracy is to be truly manifested, it is not surprising that Paul should say (Col. 1 : 19 and 2 : 9) "*that in Him should all fulness dwell,*" that "*in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*" Being thus the contemplated Theocratic personage, He could not refute the charge brought against Him by the Jews (John 5 : 18; 10 : 36; 19 : 7) that by designating Himself the Son of God, he thus "*made Himself equal with God,*" without doing violence to His Messiahship. Because Jesus is the Theocratic King, He is "*the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His Person*" (Heb. 1 : 3), and the Kingdom itself is designated "*the Kingdom of Christ and of God*" (Eph. 5 : 5), "*the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ*" (Rev. 11 : 15); and He who is to reign forever is named by Isaiah, consistently, "*the Mighty God*" (Syriac, the Mighty God of ages), "*The Everlasting Father*" (Vulgate, "the Father of the future age;" Lowth, "the Father of the everlasting age;" Chaldee, "the Man abiding forever"). That God should become incarnate, i.e. be

united with humanity in the Person of Jesus is not only not incredible, but positively *the most reasonable* matter that can be presented to us when regarded in *its true Theocratic relationship.* Let the reader consider how the Theocratic conception *as covenanted and predicted* demands it; how this was done centuries before Jesus came; how all the prophets unite in giving Him a pure, exalted Theocratic position in the Kingdom; how in His own person He is represented as reigning as David's Son and yet as David's Lord; how the fulfilment of the continued overthrow of the Theocracy and the condition of the covenanted nation is a standing proof of its historical connection; how God is portrayed as made specially accessible and present in the person of the Messiah; and then how Jesus came as predicted, David's Son and also the Son of God; how He claimed and exhibited a sufficiency to insure us that He is indeed the Christ; how He, through the tender of the Kingdom, offered Himself as the Messiah; how His Christship was rejected; how then still retaining His right and privileges, confirmed by the power of God, He postponed the manifestation of the Kingdom and of His Messiahship to the Sec. Advent; how so many things now existent in Jew and Gentile, in Church and world, attest to and establish what He as Messiah declared, and when he has passed over *the strictly connected series* of events and has seen *how requisite* all this is to meet the purest and loftiest conception of Rulership that has ever been presented to mind or heart of man, is it possible that he, or any one, can for a moment suppose that a set of fishermen, or "ignorant" disciples, or the most learned of the ancients, could concoct *a Personage so symmetrical, so correspondent with covenant and promise, so perfectly agreeing with the highest form of government, with the World's need, and with a bridging over the dark chasm between God and man, Heaven and Hades, Paradise and groaning Creation.* No one who receives the Theocracy in its true Biblical sense can doubt the divinity of Jesus, the Theocratic King, because to do so would involve a contradiction—a fatal antagonism—for it would take out of the future Theocracy what even the past possessed—*a God ruling.* Hence the deep wisdom of the Apostles, the evidence of inspiration, in adopting the very language so admirably adapted to express *the Theocratic-Davidic idea,* i.e. in uniting with David's Son, to whom as a descendant the Kingdom is more specifically promised (both for identification and for a purposed union of the Divine), such a Lordship, Godship, etc., that in Him *the pure conception* of a Theocracy is retained. Consider, too, that this was done by men hostile to all idol or man worship, who were surrounded by those who were jealous of any lessening or misconstruction of the Messianic conception, and that therefore the language used can only be consistently explained on *the basis of the Theocratic idea.* Reflect also that this was done by persons and among persons who were zealous defenders of the unity of God, and who would have esteemed it sacrilegious to appropriate to man what belonged to God; and that, therefore, the portraiture of Jesus, as given by the Apostles, can only be appropriately reconciled with the *Theocratic conception,* which instead of destroying the unity of God *actually upholds it,* since it brings God the Ruler into *oneness* (as Jesus claimed) with David's Son, causing the majesty of heaven to be reflected and exerted *in and through a visible Headship,* thus mercifully and wonderfully accommodating itself *to the needs, desires, and glory of Humanity.* Let the student deeply ponder the original Theocratic idea, retaining its original meaning then associated in external manifestation

through David's Son, and he will see the reason *why* passages which in the Old Test. are applied to God are in the New Test, *unhesitatingly applied* to Jesus (as e.g. Isa. 45 : 20 ; comp. with Rom. 14 : 10, 11 ; Isa. 40 : 3 with Matt. 3 : 1, 3 ; Zech. 12 : 10 with John 19 : 34, 37, etc., etc.) ; *why* divine worship which belonged to God as the Theocratic Ruler is *also claimed for* Jesus Christ (as e.g. John 5 : 3 ; Matt. 28 : 19 ; Phil. 2 : 11 ; Rev. 5 : 13 ; Luke 24 : 52, etc.) ; *why* perfections which exclusively belong to God are *without the least scruple attributed* to Jesus (as e.g. John 5 : 21 ; Col. 1 : 17 ; Heb. 13 : 8, etc.) so that the declaration is made (John 16 : 15), "*all things that the Father hath are mine.*" It was under the influence of this Theocratic conception, viz., that *the same Lord God* who once acted as earthly Ruler would be inseparably identified with the person of Jesus, David's Son, that even creation (John 1 : 3, 10 ; Eph. 3 : 9 ; Col. 1 : 16 ; Heb. 1 : 2, etc.) is ascribed to Him ; that pre-existence is postulated (John 8 : 58 ; John 1 : 1 ; Col. 1 : 17, etc.) of Him ; that the love, etc., rendered to Him are at the same time bestowed upon the Father (John 5 : 23, etc., 1 John 2 : 23) ; that no one could know the Father saving the Son and him to whom the Son revealed Him (Matt. 11 : 27, etc., 1 John 1 : 18) ; and all this and more because (John 14 : 10) "*I am in the Father and the Father in Me.*" The least reflection will show, that the Theocratic idea *so impenetrates* the New Test. portraiture of Jesus bringing forth such a union of the Theocratic God with David's Son—forming *the one Theocratic King* with one will, power, work, love, etc. (John 5 : 19–38, etc.)—and yet consistently placing the Son in view of the incorporation of David's line and descendant subordinately to the Father (John 5 : 19 ; 14 : 28, etc.), that it demands unreasonable credulity to imagine that the apostles through their own reason and to subserve their own purposes, created *such a matchless Theocratic likeness*, which, without a single flaw, combines the original Theocratic Ruler with the promised Theocratic King in David's line ; and, without sacrificing the humanity or exalting it above the Fatherhood, blends the two together into *an inseparable Oneness*, forming the One Person Jesus the Christ ; that in this unity, whoever sees the Son beholds also the Father. Such a conception, *so harmonious* in all its details, *so forcibly adapted* to secure the end contemplated, and *so perfectly in accord* with God's Theocratic Purpose, is, as the Bible justly claims a divine one. Let the reader test this by contrasting it with those plans originated by man, as e.g. Plato's idea of an ideal government and more recently the notions entertained respecting a "Universal Republic" or a "Universal Monarchy." Our opponents themselves concede (leaving out the moral, and only looking at the results) that if this portraiture is true, if it could be realized as expressed, it would undoubtedly bring forth the effects attributed to it. We know it to be true for the reasons, already assigned, flowing from the doctrine of the Kingdom, and which in every heir of this Kingdom and co-heir of this Theocratic King is confirmed by the experience of faith, and by the constant and continued fulfilling of events foretold by this Messiah.

Leaving the offensive and daring expressions of unbelief, it is sufficient to point out what little force there is in the affirmation of a more respectable class of unbelievers. Thus e.g. Alger (*The Solitudes*, p. 384) asserts, "To merge the divine humanity of Jesus in factitious theory of His Deity is to lose more than can be gained." In plain words the divinity (made inseparable by the Theocratic plan running from covenant to ultimate fulfilment) attributed to Jesus must be rejected, for "professed relationship to Him

(God) in His Messiahship, arrogating to Himself personally a forensic position of inconceivable power and grandeur—this language, if regarded as authentic, and taken in its literal sense, would force us to believe that He labored under *a gross delusion.*" Suppose, however, on the other hand, that the divine were not united with Him as the Theocratic ordering demands, would not this very class of writers seize upon this omission as *a fatal flaw*, and at once triumphantly accuse the evangelists and Apostles *of not comprehending* the requirements of the Christ as presented in the conception of a Theocracy. But when given, perversity makes it an objection, although it comes and supplies a yearning of humanity to have the divine to reveal itself *in an accessible form* to man, joining the Infinite and the Finite in a recognizable manner, fulfilling in a covenanted Theocratic order what some writers (as Parsons's *The Infinite and the Finite*) make progressive and to be evolved in the distant future. We cannot even agree with Luthart in his exceedingly interesting lecture (No. 4, *Bremen Lec.*, p. 133) on "The Person of Christ," when he remarks: "A man who is the appearance of God Himself, a revelation of God, who is God become man—this thought was far off from the whole ancient world, was far off even from the Old Test." "The idea did not produce the fact, but the fact produced the idea." The reverse of this is the truth, for (1) the Theocracy embraced the idea of God Himself ruling; and (2) this was co-joined in the covenant and promises to be realized in David's Son; (3) this led to the production of the fact; and (4) this was acknowledged by the chief priests when they charged Jesus with blasphemy because He claimed to be this Son, "the Christ." There is a logical and historical connection.

Obs. 9. The Theocratic Kingship assigned to Jesus, confirmed by the things pertaining to the Kingdom, at once establishes His divinity. A Theocracy presided over by *a real Theocratic King*, manifested in and through a vital union of God with man, *imperatively requires a God-man.* Our entire argument, running through these Propositions calls for just such a Theocratic King, with the humanity and the divinity, the attributes and the perfections, the humiliation and exaltation, the Son of Man and Son of God relationship, as the Word presents us. There is *nothing* to add to, or subtract from, the Theocratic portrait drawn by the Spirit, which understandeth the deep and true things of God and man. The sinlessness of Jesus, which is such an annoyance to unbelief, and the subject of many an insidious attack, is fully sustained, not merely by the well-established reasons of Apologists in general, but by its necessary relationship to this Kingdom.[1] A Theocratic King, in the full sense of the phrase, *must be* a pure, sinless, perfect Being. He is, therefore, not only covenanted as "*the Just One,*" and in all the prophecies represented as *pre-eminently* spotless, being the Lord Himself, but carefully delineated as such by His witnesses. The least reflection will show that if the Theocratic idea, which embraces the actual return and abiding of God's Rulership, is *actually* to be realized in the Person of Jesus, *then,* in the very nature of the case, *sin cannot* be predicated of Him who is, *by virtue of this Theocratic position, God-man.* From this results the unspeakable worthiness of our King, His ability to save those who are fallen, and the call upon all living creatures to ascribe "*Blessing, and Honor, and Glory, and Power*" (Rev. 5 : 13) unto Him. Indeed, if Jesus is viewed, as, in justice to Himself and the Record, He ought to be, in the light of this Theocratic position, His Divine-Human appears with an increased intensity and lustre that is overwhelming. Has the reader, e.g. ever considered that the very first message respecting the Messiah given by his forerunner John, at once impresses us with a sense of His Theocratic dignity. Who, unless He were the Theocratic King in its highest sense, could call a whole nation to repentance, and tender to them the Theocratic Kingdom upon the nation's concurrence? The demand and offer are both

so God-like, *so real Theocratic* that this alone, if other proof were lacking, stamps Jesus as *the Messiah, the veritable Christ.* Therefore it is that a large class of passages, however explained by the critics and however men may legitimately or unlawfully interpret them, still contain a sufficiency to teach us the true Theocratic position of Jesus ; as e.g. Tit. 2 : 13, which some read as if the great God and the Saviour Jesus were identical, and which others read as if God designates the Father distinctively from the Son, but which, whatever reading (see Lange, Alford, etc.) is preferred, still brings forth *the pre-eminent dignity* of the Saviour. For, as Alford (*loci*) says : "Whichsoever way taken, the passage is just as important a testimony to the divinity of our Saviour : according to one way, by asserting *His possession of Deity ;* according to the other, even more strikingly asserting *His equality in glory* with the Father, in a way which would be blasphemy if predicted of any of the sons of men." The criticism of isolated passages does not affect the main question, and cannot change *the imbedded Theocratic position* assigned to Jesus by virtue of which we are assured that the revelation of the Father's glory is in and through Him (comp. e.g. John 17 : 5 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 16, 17 ; Matt. 16 : 27, etc.). We need no Napoleon (Montholon's *Memoirs*) to inform us : "I know men and I tell you that Jesus Christ is not a man," etc., for the Theocratic idea, so consecutively evolved and finally manifested in Jesus requires no such eulogies from man. The fainter praises of Renan, Mills, etc., are made with eyes blinded and hearts closed *to the Theocratic conception.* Therefore, we believe that, when the time arrives for this Theocratic King to come and re-establish the Theocratic Kingdom, then indeed (Rev. 21 : 3) "the tabernacle of God" (the same tabernacle now taken away, comp. Acts 15 : 16 ; Isa. 16 : 5 ; Isa. 33 : 20, etc.) "is with men and *He*" (i.e. God in the Person of the Theocratic Ruler) "*will dwell with them and they shall be His people, and God Himself*" (being the Theocratic Ruler) "*shall be with them and be their God*"—and then shall be fulfilled (Isa. 54 : 5) : "*Thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall He be called.*"[2]

[1] There is something inexpressibly saddening in the trial of Irving respecting the sinlessness of Christ, both parties holding to the vital fact that sinlessness was maintained, but differing concerning the power of His humanity to maintain it. See *Life of Irving* by Mrs. Oliphant, who well observes that such an agreement in essentials should never have led to Irving's excommunication.

[2] It is *a gratifying* fact that all the early Millenarian Fathers united in Jesus the Divine and Human (comp. Hagenbach's *His. Doc.*, sects. 65 and 66, Neander's *Ch. His., and His. Dog.*, Dorner's *Person of Christ*, Uhlman's *Sinlessness of Christ*, etc.), but it is not generally noticed that such a union is part, yea, the heart, of their *Theocratic* belief, viz., that Jesus being the destined Theocratic King, the Christ, is the One in and through whom *God reigns.* Priestley published a work entitled, *History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ, compiled from Original Writers, proving that the Christian Church was at first Unitarian*" (4 vols., 8vo, Birmingham, 1782). Against this assumption of Priestley's it is sufficient to say that the prevailing Millenarian view of the first centuries, which incorporated as its foundation principle *the Theocratic ordering*, necessarily made Jesus far more than man, even divine, in and through whom God ruled. This fact has very recently been strongly proven by Rev. Cook in his Boston lectures from extracts taken from the fathers, although he might have immensely strengthened these by showing their intimate and necessary relationship to the Millenarianism then held. A firm believer in the Theocratic Kingdom, *as covenanted and predicted*, cannot possibly be a Unitarian. A mass of Scripture, aside from the nature of the Kingdom, forbids it, as e.g. a single passage, Micah 5 : 1 (rendering given by Dr. Schaff in *The Person of Christ*, p. 200), "But Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, too small to be among the thousands of Judah" (i.e. the

central towns where the heads of thousands, or subordinate divisions of tribes resided) "out of thee shall come forth unto me *One who is to be the Ruler in Israel, whose origin is from the first of time, from the days of eternity.*" Burton gives a mass of information in his *Testimony of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*, Sears's *The Fourth Gospel, the Heart of Christ*, Reubelt's *Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Lewis's *Divine Human of the Scriptures*, Young's *Christ of History*, and others. The testimony of ancients, outside of Christianity, sustains the primitive view, so that e.g. Gibbon (*Decl. and Fall*, vol. 2, p. 9) does not question the early teaching of the Church on this subject, and refers to "Libanius (who) praises Porphyry and Julian for confuting the folly of a sect, which styles a dead man of Palestine, God, and the Son of God. Socrates, His. Eccles. 3 : 23," etc. (comp. also p. 305 and 315). When Pliny (Epis. Pliny 10, 97) says "that the Christians were accustomed to sing hymns to Christ as to God;" when the leading objection of the Jews was to this assumption of the divine; when the apologists met such objections with reasons to sustain it; when martyrs refused the application of divine to emperors and heathen gods, but joyfully acknowledged it in Jesus, we have sufficient evidence of early belief (comp. Van Oosterzee's art. "The Son of Man" in *Princeton Review*, July, 1878). Pressense (*The Early Days of Christianity*, p. 62) remarks on the martyrdom of Stephen: "His last prayer is addressed distinctly to Jesus Christ, and by his final homage he renders dying testimony to His divinity. It was fitting that this great truth should be thus proclaimed by the first of martyrs." The *Theocratic idea* vindicates this worship, and hence we have John 5 : 23; Phil. 2 : 11; Rev. 5 : 13; 7 : 9; 15 : 6; Rom. 9 : 5, etc.

Obs. 10. The life of Jesus on earth has been highly eulogized even by unbelief, so that He is represented, by those unwilling to accept of His claims to the Divine and Supernatural, as "the ideal of Humanity," "the Ideal Man," "the man pre-eminent," etc. We accept of this testimony as far as it goes, and add to it, that if we consider the covenanted and predicted claims of Jesus to the Theocratic ordering, we find in that life abundant evidence, *cumulative in fact*, that in every particular this Son of David acted and lived *in the consciousness* of His ultimate Theocratic position, so that everything in Him, and coming from Him, was *eminently worthy* of the Theocratic King. Thus e.g. the contrast between His condition (one of poverty) and the vast extent of His knowledge, the ability exhibited in meeting and confounding the representative and intelligent men of the nation, the high culture and taste manifested in His teaching so that they ever have commended themselves for beauty and force to reason, the exalted sentiments so far in advance of the age proceeding from "the carpenter," the dignity and nobleness of His character, the remarkable adhesion to His principles and aims irrespective of a threatened death, the conduct at the trial and crucifixion, the high virtue, morality, and piety inculcated compared with the teaching then extant, His public and private life contrasted with that of Reformers and great men, the authority assumed and sustained in connection with an exceeding tenderness of spirit and forgiveness—these are points we love to contemplate as indicative of the high and noble character of the King. The superiority of Jesus as a man, as eminent Apologists have noticed, developed at a time when gross impurity and corruption was prevalent, developed in antagonism to national pride and prejudice, is a stepping-stone to the acknowledgment of the full Theocratic idea—of something allied with Him which elevates and exalts His humanity, which —fortified by the purest life and sealed by the noblest death—establishes His claim to *Oneness* with the Father, constituting Him the needed perfect Redeemer, and "*The Faithful and True.*"

We must receive the portraiture of Jesus in its *entirety* as given, or else we mar it with some deformity. Rogers (*Superhuman Origin of the Bible*, p. 34, etc.) at length ably

shows that the lofty character of Jesus could not have originated with the Jewish disciples, and that, if a mere man, the claims of authority, Supernaturalism, etc., would vitiate the portrait and render Him unworthy of honor. He forcibly declares (p. 430, in reply to Renan) that if Jesus pretended to work miracles, or simply fancied that He had wrought them, His credibility and moral greatness would be destroyed. And yet a Jesus shorn of His greatness and majesty, stripped of His noblest attributes and perfection, is made the subject of eulogy. An anon. writer, of "The Purpose of Existence," while busily engaged in denying the statements of the Bible, the Supernatural element, and the cardinal doctrines pertaining to Christ, professes, amid his destructive work, a high sort of reverence for Jesus, saying: "All that I believe, all that I have said, and all that I have yet to say, I have learned from one to whom I look up as the wisest and most perfect mortal that ever lived—from Jesus of Nazareth Himself—purest, holiest of created beings!" What does such praise amount to after denying the Christship of Jesus and rejecting His claims to the miraculous and divine, and after accounting for the rise of Christianity and its essential doctrines as follows: "The men from Cyprus and Cyrene, but more especially Lusias of the latter place, were the true authors of Christianity," viz., in ascribing to Jesus a resurrection, translation, divinity, etc. What admirable wisdom, consistency, and knowledge of the ancient records! Fairbairn (*Typology*, vol. 1, p. 346) refers to the fact that the lines of prophecy clearly indicate the divine-human united in the person of the Christ, and insists, correctly, that this is a foundation indispensable to a realization of the promises of God. Hence he observes that the evangelists all notice it; John in his formal statement that the Word was made flesh; Matthew and Luke in the miraculous conception constituting Jesus "the Son of the Highest;" and Mark pronouncing Him to be "the Son of God."

PROPOSITION 200. *While the Kingdom is given to Jesus Christ as the Son of Man, He becomes thereby the actual representative of God, manifesting God in the Person of One related to humanity.*

The covenants specify that future Ruler as the seed of Abraham and David ; David and the Prophets, corroborated by the Gospels, Epistles, and Apoc., describe Him as One far greater than man, having the Divine united with Him, thus forming *the desirable Theocratic-Davidic King.* The remarkable and most forcible feature comes forth, that what was once separated in this Theocratic Kingdom is *united in the person* of this King. When the Theocracy was first established, the earthly Ruler (i.e., God acting as such) was separate (i.e. in personality) from the subordinate human ruler (as e.g. God was separate and distinct from the subordinate ruler David), but in this revived form it is God's Purpose to have *both joined, firmly united in the same person.* This wonderful Plan proposes that there shall be a real Son of David united and identified with the Godhead, thus constituting Him just such a Ruler *as a perfected* Theocratic Kingdom on earth should possess to make it powerful and absolute, related both to God and man. While sitting on the throne of His glory as "the Son of Man," He, through His God-like attributes and Oneness with the Father, manifests the Father to us. Inspiration alone could produce *such a Theocratic Plan, so glorious, complete, and adapted to a perfect rule.*

Lange (*Com. Rev.*, p. 406) justly observes : "In the Coming of Christ God shall *perfectly manifest* Himself as Jehovah, the Covenant God : faithful to Himself ; faithful to His people ; faithful to His justice toward all."

Obs. 1. This again brings out prominently the doctrine respecting *the Person* of Christ—a significant one too as the day is approaching. Our view rejects on the one side the old opinion, revamped by modern Rationalism that Christ is a mere man, for the acts that He performs, the new Creation, the Supernatural, the universal judging, the resurrection power exerted, etc., prove Him to be more than man, the Son of God in the highest sense. It rejects on the other hand the Gnostic idea, and its modern philosophical tendency, which either virtually ignores or despises the human in Christ, or else makes it play *a very subordinate* part in His history and that of Redemption, bringing forward the divine in an exclusive onesided manner. Looking only at the covenants, the work of Redemption proceeds on the ground that Jesus is man, proper man, of the seed of David, thus identified with the race and of the same nature with Adam.

Coming necessarily in the elect line, He professes complete humanity, for His birth, growth, expansion of intellectual and moral powers, eating, drinking, temptation, life, sufferings, and death—all indicate this. But looking at the work which is to be performed, the Supernatural connected with Him, the portrayal of His offices, attributes, power, etc., we apprehend one possessing in connection with the human, a divine nature. Both are united to form a Saviour *capable of performing in all respects the great work of Redemption*, which is so intimately connected with *a Theocratic ordering*, with the precious principles of moral and civil government, with the purity and glory of God Himself, and with the highest interests of man and the race.

In brief, we accept of the Person of Christ as given by Dr. Dorner and others, and reject with them as anti-scriptural the theories which teach the identity of the human and divine, the conversion or transmutation of the one into the other, or the commixture of the two to form another nature. Jesus Christ is *the same "yesterday, to-day, and forever;"* and this unchangeableness imparts faith and hope. Since there is much vagueness, and even rashness expressed respecting the pre-existence of Jesus, a few words may be in place. There is no proper pre-existence of Jesus as "the Christ," the promised "Messiah." Fully admitting the pre-existence of the divine, this itself does not constitute "the Christ," for it is *the union* of the divine and human *in David's Son* that forms "the Messiah"—the historical, covenanted Christ. The notion of a pre-existent Christ, notwithstanding the mystical theories finely wrought of Böhme, Poiret, etc., is contradictory to covenant and prophecy, for before David was born to whom the covenant was given (i.e. the assurance was given that out of his line should the Messiah spring), and before Jesus was born as David's descendant, "the Christ" *as such* could not exist. Therefore while the divine is represented as pre-existent, the human nature, and the union of the divine and human in one person, is never thus described. Lutheran as our predilections are, it is but just to say that in this matter the Reformed (comp. Hagenbach's *His. Doc.*, vol. 2, p. 352) were nearer the truth. Our line of argument, relating to the Kingdom, is only concerned in *the covenanted* Christ, *the historical* Messiah. Hence while believing e.g. that (John 12 : 41) Isaiah saw (6 : 1–10) the divine pertaining to "the Christ," we cannot receive the inference of Edwards (*His. Redempt.*, p. 148) that he saw "the human nature" of the Christ.

Obs. 2. Passing by the necessity induced by law itself (as presented by theologians in systems of divinity) and especially by the preordained Theocratic ordering (as evinced in the course of our argument) for such a constituted Messiah, attention is now directed to the important fact, that such a union of natures, as was sustained before His death and continued unimpaired after it, *evermore remains.* This is *a covenanted necessity*, for David's Son, and no other, is the appointed King. Therefore the same union is still so preserved, the vital relationship of the two natures is still so continued, that we have the same Divine-Human Jesus to-day and evermore. The *same Jesus* that the disciples saw ascend to heaven shall come again in like manner, unchanged. The same Son of David that ascended must also descend, or else the covenant cannot be realized. Indeed the entire tenor of the Word evinces this, that since his ascension there has been no conversion of human nature into the Divine (just as little as the opposite advocated by some, that in the incarnation the divine was converted into the human—a transmutation dogma doing violence to the Infinite), although Augustine rashly says: "God became man that man may become God." A glorification was indeed experienced, but this did not destroy the human, just as the glorification of the saints does not change the personality and identity of their humanity. This is the more essential to

notice, since eminent men overlooking the covenant connection, teach the contrary.

Thus e.g. Neander (Prop. 81), because it is said that Jesus is declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection, hastily infers that He loses that which distinctively appertains to Him as David's Son. He thus substantially follows the system of Schwenkfeld (Hagenbach's *His. Doc.*, vol. 2, sec. 266), who asserted : "All that by which Christ is David's Son, is laid aside and lost (in His divine nature) ; His whole nature is renewed and deified." (Comp. Kurtz's *Ch. His.*, vol. 2, p. 155). The Christology of Swedenborg (Hagenbach, vol. 2, Sec. 299) also teaches that "the human which He received from Mary was gradually laid aside and the heavenly divine body substituted for it." Many indorse such views, substituting an "ideal" Christ for the *veritable* "*historical*" Christ, and forget that God's own oath-bound covenant, in order to be realized, *positively demands* the perpetuation of David's descendant. The old opinion of Origen (Hagenbach, vol. 1, p. 177) that "the humanity of Jesus ceased to exist after His exaltation," inflicts a deadly blow to covenant promise made to David's Son. Hence the Spirit, expressly to guard us against such covenant destroying error, teaches us that when Jesus comes again He comes as (Rev. 22 : 16) "*the root and the offspring of David ;*" that He comes to occupy "*the throne of His father David*" (Luke 1 : 32), because the covenant made with David affirms (as Peter states) that Jesus *after the flesh* should sit on David's throne. Even the Jews held (John 12 : 34) "out of the law, that Christ abideth forever."

Our doctrine, therefore, is utterly opposed to the old but revived Eutychian theory, that the human nature was "deified," i.e. not simply glorified, but transformed into God ; to the more refined notion that it became "divine" in the sense that it was so changed as to lose the essence of the human body and could no longer be recognized as related to David ; to the notion of several bodies (so Weigel, etc.), the mere appearance of a body (Docetæ, etc.), and all other theories which deny a proper continued, recognizable humanity. Of course it rejects as utterly untenable the view that Christ is simply the incarnation of the divine idea, or that it is the outgrowth of the divine in the human to aid the race in giving an exemplar, in so far as these are pressed in hostility to the covenanted Theocratic idea.

Obs. 3. Having thus defined our position, another step in the divine procedure results as worthy of special notice : this same Jesus, the true Son of God and of David, so distinctive in both divine and human, is yet destined to manifest Himself in a way (i.e. Theocratic order) by which it will be seen that the Son of David is to perform, in the future, *a transcendant part* in the history of the world. Even now it has been observed by various writers that the idea of humanity united with the divine and realized in Christ, is *the Key* to Protestant theology ; but our argument shows, that when the still future manifestation of the same is properly considered, it forms *the Key of Redemption, perfected salvation, Theocratic relationship*, and the *history* of the world. It is the goal toward which all things are tending—the culmination of God's Purpose in government and restitution.

This totally disproves the inferential argument which fills entire volumes against the personal reign of the Son of David, as e.g. such a work as Carson's *The Personal Reign of Christ During the Millennium Proved to be Impossible* (London, 1873). All such efforts, however well meant, are derogatory to the Son of Man, to the oath-bound covenants of God, and to the perfected redemption of man (which redemption includes not merely the individual but society, the race as a race, and creation). Comp. Props. 81, 49, 120, 146, 152, etc.

Obs. 4. From the Person of Jesus and His unchangeableness, we deduce : (1) the confirmation of the Kingdom to the veritable Son of David (to whom covenanted). He remaining the unchangeable Seed to whom the inheritance of the Kingdom is promised ; (2) the grandeur of this Kingdom, its irresistible power, its exaltation, its universality, etc., in virtue of

the divine united with Him ; (3) the perfect Theocratic rule exhibited, so that (what is stated in the Proposition appears) we have the possession of a Ruler who is *a real representative of God*—who manifests God to us *in His own Person and Kingship*. In this Theocratic representation alone, do we find the chasm between the Infinite and Finite completely and satisfactorily filled. According to "the sure mercies of David" the Finite ever remains with the Infinite, and it is the pleasure of the Infinite to glorify, and manifest itself through, the Finite. This truth we gladly accept, for it has an important relation to the Kingdom.

Here we find ultimately the old antagonism of Lutheran and Reformed reconciled. The old Lutheran formula taught that "the finite is capable of the infinite," and here in the Rulership of a Person in whom two natures are vitally and indissolubly united, we find it true ; but equally true is the apparent paradox of the Reformed when they said "the finite is incapable of the infinite," seeing that it requires the union of two such natures, without change, to effect it—for the one is sustained in its action by the other, so that in the Rulership—the Theocratic rule—the one cannot be separated from the other. These two contradictory statements really embrace the truth in its totality, and therefore prevent us from regarding Jesus as merely human or merely divine, but as having both united. This prevents us, as stated, from entering the enticing Pantheistic and mystical regions in which man is changed into God, in which the divine exclusively appears, or in which the humanity is thrown aside as something that may have been useful in its time, but now is either unnecessary, superfluous, or very subsidiary.

Obs. 5. This Kingdom being different from (although given and sustained by) the Divine Sovereignty of God evinced in Creation, etc., and being a restoration of the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom, which takes the place of human governments, it follows, that it demands, in consistency, *the manifestation of God in the character of an earthly Ruler*, and this is done *in the Person of "the Christ."* A pure Theocracy requires this representation of Rulership. This is admitted (i.e. the earthly Rulership) by writers on the former Theocracy, which we have shown is only an initiatory form or a foreshadowing of the rule of this Kingdom. Kurtz (*His. Old Cov.*, vol. 3, p. 107), speaking of the former, forcibly says : "His intention to become Israel's King could only be understood as meaning, that in the case of Israel, He would raise and consolidate His universal rule *into one of a special nature ; that in His own Person He would undertake the duties and claim the privileges of sovereignty*, which He left in other cases to earthly kings. In a word, Jehovah was about to stoop to be not merely heavenly *but earthly King over Israel.* So far as Israel was a nation, *an earthly political commonwealth, He did not refuse to place Himself in the list of earthly* kings." Now in the change from the Theocratic to the Theocratic-Davidic, the rights of God, as already explained, as the Supreme earthly Ruler *were retained.* The Kings of Israel acted as vicegerents of the Theocracy, and hence the earthly vicegerent, who acted *as God's representative* in the Kingdom, was specially anointed, consecrated, or set apart for the office by God Himself, and was known by the honorable and significant title of "*God's anointed*" and "*the Lord's anointed.*"[1] But notice in the Person of Jesus, anointed for this purpose, this Theocratic representation assumes *its highest and purest form*, for what the former Theocratic King (as David, Solomon, etc.), could only do as vicar, by acting as deputy, Jesus Christ performs as *a real Representative* of God—God being united personally with Him. Hence *the glory and blessedness* of this Theocracy.

[1] Our argument exposes the absurdity and arrogance of Gentile kings also (without a Theocratic claim) assuming to be such "anointed by God," and "ruling by special divine appointment." Not only the Papacy, but Prelacy, etc., has aided in keeping up such a gloss over Gentile domination. How God regards such ruling is seen from the prophecies and the expressive symbolical representations of "beasts," and yet such, under the professed sanction of religion, are to be transformed into "God's anointed" to secure the reverence of the multitude (comp. Prop. 164).

Obs. 6. Jesus, therefore, invariably represents Himself *as manifesting the Father;* that whosoever (as e.g. Thomas) *has seen Him has seen the Father also;* that He is *One with the Father;* that He is the expressed image of God; all which is founded in His being the contemplated *Theocratic personage.* As Son of Man receiving the Kingdom from the Father, and as such performing the will and the work of the Father in the Kingdom, yet in connection with this is *the intimate and enduring union of the Godhead and in its fulness*, so that this very Theocratic Kingdom re-erected under His auspices is, in view of its unity and firm Theocratic position, interchangeably called Christ's Kingdom, the Father's Kingdom, and the Kingdom of God and His Christ. The Theocratic relationship that the Son of David sustains to God the Father, *necessarily* brings forth this representative condition—one, too, that is essential to His position.

By saying, therefore, that the Son of David is the Representative of God the Father, we mean more than merely a delegated Representative—we mean a complete self-manifestation of the Father in the Son, so that it will be true that he who seeth the Son seeth the Father also. This manifestation is delicately expressed in the Greek, as e.g. in Titus 2 : 13, where but one Greek article is applied to both "God" and "Saviour" comp. Fausset's *Com. loci*).

Obs. 7. Consequently attention is again called to the fact, that the humanity of Jesus, the groundwork of covenanted promise, is never lost sight of, but is brought forward in *the most prominent manner as an essential factor in redemption.* As the Son of Man, He forgives sins and performs miracles (e.g. Matt. 9 : 6); He is Lord over the Sabbath day (Matt. 12 : 8); He is the Mighty One (Matt. 13 : 41); He is to come and sit on the Throne of His glory (Math. 25 : 31); He is ordained to be the Judge of the World (Acts 17 : 31). From these and similar Scriptures, we find that, in *the strictest agreement* with the covenant and the Kingdom promised to David's Son, the humanity of Jesus must be placed in the biblical position, *as the appointed means* of manifesting God to us *Theocratically* in purposes of Salvation still future. It is through this very predetermined Kingdom that all this will be performed, according with the uniform testimony of the prophets. Hence, even Fleetwood (*Life of Christ*, p. 105), while unable from His standpoint to make any use of it, admits that the phrase Son of Man "when applied to our great Redeemer denotes His human nature, *and at the same time conveys an idea of that glorious Kingdom* over which He was in His nature to preside" (comp. Prop. 81). It has already been shown that this title forcibly recalls the Davidic covenant, King or Kingdom; the use made of it by Jesus corroborates this, while the additions appended by prophecy indicate that this Son of Man is, in the highest, noblest sense, *the actual, visible representative of God on the earth*, so that when He returns to rule, *God Himself* shall again *Theocratically* dwell with man, and exert a corresponding power over all the world.

Obs. 8. Hence, too, arises the significancy of the name "*Immanuel*" given Matt. 1 : 23, to the Son of Man. Keeping before us the demands of the covenant, and regarding the time of Christ's Sec. Coming as one of trouble (comp. e.g. Isa. 7 : 13, 14 and Matt. 1 : 23 with Zech. 14, and Rev. 19—see Props. 115, 160, 161, 162, 163, etc.) so that He is *the Deliverer*, we are assured that the main fulfilment spoken of by Matthew is still future. In this future Theocratic rule, He will pre-eminently be "*Immanuel*," i.e. "*God with us.*" The name is expressive of *this covenanted* Kingly position by which we obtain in our very midst a powerful, majestic, almighty Ruler, who evidences the same by perfected salvation and government. Some, as Jerome, think the name denotes divine aid and protection; others, as Irenæus, the assumption of human nature by God, but while these ideas may be derived from it, it certainly has a deeper reference in that it recalls, and compresses into a single word, the covenanted Theocratic Kingdom in which, as its leading characteristic, *God shall be truly and really with us.* The name is indicative of the fulfilment of covenanted promises in the Person of Christ; and, therefore, *in its fulness of meaning is yet to be verified.* If significant of (as Jones, *Notes*, p. 40) "the incarnate relation of Jehovah to His people," this will appear still more impressively when this same Jesus returns to manifest and exert His royal prerogatives.

Obs. 9. This subject is also suggestive why the Son of Man is now placed at the right hand of God. Being the One through whom the Father is to be manifested in the Coming Kingdom, the relation existing between God and David's Son is such that *no honor is too great* for the latter. Besides this, the expressive nearness and exaltation of this descendant of David's, *confirms* the blessed hope that such a representative Rulership is thus acknowledged and rendered certain. As our argument of the specific Theocratic-Davidic Rulership involves, this sitting at the right hand of the Father embraces the inference, that being the destined Representative Ruler, He is inferior in rank to the Father. This is fully admitted by our opponents (as e.g. Knapp, *Ch. Theol.*, p. 355), who tell us that He does not possess "full equality in rank or dignity." The reason underlying this, is because this Kingdom is something separate and distinct from the Divine Sovereignty (Props. 79 and 80) being *a specific form of Government under the Headship of a Representative*, given to David's Son, who acts only in the predicted and covenanted Theocratic capacity, and, therefore, *must necessarily ever be subordinate* to the Father as Paul teaches, 1 Cor. 15 : 27.

Obs. 10. The reader will readily perceive that with such a Representative Ruler—Theocratic in Person and Office—two things will inevitably be secured. (1) The *faithfulness* of the Theocratic King. Former Theocratic kings, even the best (as David) were unfaithful, swerved from duty, etc., and some even rebelled, but *this One*, ever just and faithful, ever *One* with the Father a God-man, insures a reign *never marked* by a mistake or defect, much less by unfaithfulness. (2) The *stability* of the Theocracy. The former Theocracy was overthrown because of the sins of rulers and people, but this one restored shall ever remain, being founded on the Divine Purpose realized and exhibited in such power and glory that nothing can ever shake its permanency (comp. Prop. 159).

Obs. 11. Let the student reflect: if the Lord Jehovah did not consider it *derogatory to His honor and glory to act* (as a multitude of able writers admit) *in the capacity of an earthly Ruler* under the initiatory form of the Theocracy, *how then can it be derogatory* to the honor and glory of the Son of Man, David's Son, to come and act *in a like capacity?* This in itself should cause those persons, who slightingly and dishonorably (to Christ) speak of this future reign of Jesus on earth (as advocated by us), *to be careful* lest they be found treating with disrespect and contempt the most astonishing, desirable, and glorious of God's provisions for man's welfare and the happiness of the world, and which immeasurably redounds to God's praise and glory. (Comp. Prop. 203 and 204.)

PROPOSITION 201. *If a Kingdom, such as is covenanted to the Son of Man, David's Son, is not set up, then God's efforts at government in and through an earthly rulership proves a failure.*

God *has had a visible* Kingdom here on the earth ; owing to the sinfulness of the people *the goal contemplated* by its erection was not reached ; instead of such a Kingdom as would have been exhibited if the nation had been obedient (e.g. Ps. 81 : 8–16, etc.), it was taken from them, postponed, and will only be restored after a definite time fixed by God ; now if such a restoration here on earth is *not* effected, *it places God in the position of a Ruler who in His attempt at an earthly rule has been defeated*, and who has been unable to erect His Kingdom in a permanent and universal form. *If not restored* in greater power and glory, *God has failed* to establish a Theocracy. Well may it then be asked, *is not His own honor* involved in a final re-establishment? (Comp. Prop. 117, Obs. 6.)

Obs. 1. Our argument proves that the covenants, the prophecies, the continued incarnate relationship of Jesus—in brief, all that has been thus far advanced—clearly show that God *will not fail* in His Theocratic Plan —His proposed Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom. A postponement for the wisest of purposes, is *no failure.* When contemplating the reasons given for such a postponement ; when beholding the preparatory provisions constantly going on ; when seeing the Jewish nation, notwithstanding its rejection for a time, remarkably preserved in order to facilitate such a restoration when the period arrives—we have God and His Word *fully vindicated* and we can have *a strong assurance* that His purposes fail not. God's pleasure has fixed a time for realization, and that we reverently and patiently await.

Obs. 2. Let the reader turn to Prop. 200, Obs. 5, and see what Kurtz (who utters the views of many able writers) says of God being "*earthly King over Israel.*" Now there is no dispute respecting the past failure of this Kingdom, arising from the sinfulness and consequent unworthiness of the nation ; and all allow that for many centuries this Theocratic Kingdom has been overthrown and non-existing. Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts made to place the Christian Church in the room of this Theocracy, every candid writer freely admits that *the previously existing Kingdom no longer survives*, and that at the present God is not manifested, as He once was, *an earthly Ruler*, ruling through *a representative* as in the adopted

Davidic line. Now if this evermore continues, and God does not re-establish His Theocracy, He has *then permanently failed in carrying out His own Theocratic idea.* Shall this ever be said of God, that He undertook a work *that He cannot accomplish*, or that the sinfulness of man *defeated* His ultimate purpose, or that, unable to proceed in a set purpose, He *changed* His Plan to accommodate Himself to human imperfection. No! when God undertakes a work, we may well abide *His own time* for its accomplishment.

Take e.g. the meaning given to the Theocracy by Fairbairn (*Typology*, p. 379), viz., that "the Jewish Theocracy was an attempt to realize, on *the visible theatre* of the present world and within a circumscribed region, the idea of the Divine Kingdom, to establish a community of saints." Now shall this attempt at *a visible* government, uniting State and Church in such a community, fail? The answer is self-evident: *never;* it may be delayed in order to make provision for its realization, but failure is an impossibility, seeing that *God* has undertaken this work.

Obs. 3. The Church does not meet, as we have previously shown, the conditions of the Theocracy. The Theocratic incorporated throne and Kingdom of David, the earthly Ruler, the expressly covenanted promises pertaining to the Kingdom, are plainly lacking, and so visibly lacking that it is only by *the grossest violation* of the grammatical sense and *the most extravagant* spiritualizing of covenant language that men can even remotely make out of the Church a Theocracy. But take even this attempt to substitute the Church in the place of the Theocracy, then God's effort at Theocratic rule as once exhibited proves an utter failure, simply because the Church (however precious and glorious) *fails to bring out the peculiar, distinctive features of the Theocratic rule.* Can this be so? No! never; the Church itself, as the early Church (more logical and consistent) believed, is *only preparatory* to the Theocracy.

It may be added, as history too plainly attests, that the union of State and Church does not meet, owing to human infirmity, the requirements of a Theocracy, for wherever the trial has been made the State has lorded it over the Church, bringing her into servitude, or else the Church has trampled the civil rights under her feet. The union, while biblical *only in the manner and time* which God has indicated, is unnatural and forced in the present dispensation. Men endeavor *to forestall* God's own appointments and *to antedate* the period and power designated by Himself, and thus only bring calamity and reproach upon themselves. There is a foundation of truth even in the extremest Erastianism, viz., that we are to derive belief and worship from the civil power; there is force and pertinency in many of the statements of Hooker (*Eccl. Polity*), Grotius (Treat. and Annots.), and others, but only as we refer them for a practical application in the still future Theocratic reign of "the Son of Man," in which State and Church will be safely and permanently united. To commingle now things which are (in consequence of human weakness, etc.) opposed one to the other, i.e. in interests, aims, motives, results, etc., is only to add to our disappointments.

Obs. 4. God has instituted, as something pertaining to Himself, a Theocratic ordering; He has embraced this in a covenant, confirmed its certainty by oath, reiterated His determination again and again to have it realized, instituted a series of preparations having decided reference to this end—*how can then the restoration of the Theocracy prove a failure?* It is utterly impossible. When in the Coming Kingdom at the Second Advent, as predicted, this "*God-King*" (so Kurtz significantly calls this Theocratic King) is restored in actual rule, men will be surprised that this Theocratic feature *so plainly revealed* should ever have been doubted; see-

ing that all things, including the very Person of the Christ, tend to show *that God's Plan of Government cannot possibly fail*, because Jesus is most admirably, most wonderfully fitted to exhibit the personal supervision of a "*God-King*." Divinity, humanity, and royalty being thus combined in the Son of Man, there is a return to the old form (i.e. Theocratic, with additions and changes to adapt it to the renewed régime) in the restored commonwealth by which the religious commandments again become political and the political become religious—in which the civil, political, and religious *are happily blended under one All-wise, All-powerful Theocratic Headship*. God's rule in the covenanted form cannot fail; we must, if believing and honoring God, look to the future for its realization.

Obs. 5. The nearest approach to this Theocratic rule by a representative, is that afforded by the Roman Church, in its professed vicegerent, the Pope. But this, notwithstanding its claims, power, etc., is *an arrogant imitation and assumption* of the rights and privileges of the Son of Man, David's Son. Forgetting under the favoring Origenistic interpretation, that the covenants and promises all delegate this earthly representation of God in a visible Kingdom *to the seed of David alone*, they assume to spiritualize these, making the reign of the Son of Man in heaven, delegating His earthly rule to the Papacy, and, in the boldness of profanation, actually proceeding to apply covenant and prophetic promises, exclusively belonging to David's Son, to the Popes personally (even the titles of "the Christ" have been thus prostituted). Their theologians, seeing in themselves more of the outward manifestation of a Kingdom under a consolidated form and guiding head, claim on this ground a decided superiority over Protestantism; and that if it did not thus exist in such a manner, then a Kingdom under the rule of God's Representative as predicted is a failure, for no such Kingdom, unless in their Church, can elsewhere be found. To this the Word replies: it is not necessary to look for it *now existing*, for it stands *postponed until He comes whose right it is* to re-establish it. When Jesus so plainly predicts *its postponement* to the Sec. Advent, it is *pure assumption* in men to profess to found a Theocratic Kingdom, in this or that form, *before that Advent*. The non-existence of the Theocracy at present (as covenanted to no other than to Jesus Himself) while no proof of failure to be set up at the time determined by God is *a standing rebuke* to the boldness which can assume that it is the covenanted Kingdom itself, and that its Popes truly act in the place allotted by God's oath to David's Son. Indeed, our entire argument, as we proceed, is hostile and condemning to all these Papal pretensions, showing them utterly subversive of the prerogatives belonging to the Son of Man.

Obs. 6. If we are never to see this Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom re-established under the covenanted seed, and the glorious predictions of the prophets realized in it, then God's direct rule, *in its Theocratic outward* manifestations, has borne *but little sway* in this earth. Infidels, keen-scented, have seized this very feature, and used it as an argument against the Bible. They contrast the comparatively small Kingdom of Israel, within a very contracted territory, with the mighty empires which ruled over large portions of the earth, and which actually (permissively) overthrew the Theocratic Kingdom, and from such a comparison draw deductions of failure, insignificancy, etc. To this we reply: (1) we must allow God to assign the

reasons for such a contracted condition and the subsequent withdrawal of His government; (2) that in view of the reasons given by Him (sustained by a continuous chain of facts, our faith is confirmed in the final renewal and universal exaltation of the very throne and Kingdom, which, because of the sinfulness of the nation, at one time remained contracted and inferior in its outward dominion and world relationship; (3) that when this restoration takes place, the Theocratic rule will embrace the whole earth, all nations, as predicted, and hence *wisdom and prudence* teach us to await the development of God's Purpose in this direction.

PROPOSITION 202. *If the Kingdom of the Son of Man, as covenanted, is not established, then the earth will lack in its history the exhibition of a perfect government.*

The idea, given by God in His unbounded wisdom and thus far developed, of a "God-King," *alone meets the notion of a perfect government.* The union of the human and the divine in the Ruler, and the perfection of the King Himself, these form the *solid foundation* for a complete Kingdom.

Obs. 1. The Bible emphatically teaches, in its Millennial descriptions, a Kingdom here on the earth over man in the flesh, which shall exhibit in a striking administration the principles, laws, results, etc., of a government *beyond all others, and adapted in every respect* to meet all the requisites to secure stability, happiness, etc. (comp. e.g. Isa. chs. 60, 54, 61, etc.). Simply admit that the oath-confirmed covenant will be verified just as it grammatically reads, and then notice that the Son of Man, as constituted, will be this King, that associated with Him are His chosen brethren as associated rulers, that the Millennial portrayals describe this reign as still future, and it will be seen how *this perfect government can, and will be, realized.* On the other hand, reject these things, confine the Kingdom to the Church, limit the reign of the Son of Man to Heaven, etc., and you have not, and cannot receive, such a visible, outward universal Kingdom or dominion, in all respects perfectly adapted to the civil as well as the religious wants of humanity, as the Word of God tells us—if we take its plain grammatical sense—to anticipate.

The essential idea of such a visible, outward world-Kingdom is strongly advocated by recent leading theologians, and the Chiliastic idea (however represented logically defective) is doctrinally incorporated to suit their systems. Thus e.g Martensen (*Ch. Dog.*, S. 281) proclaims his faith, that Christianity will not merely be a "struggling power in the world, but a world-conquering, a world-ruling power likewise." "The State and institutions of municipal life shall then be governed by Christian principle," etc. But he forgets to tell us *how* to reconcile all this with e.g. S. 279, where down to the Sec. Advent he gives no place for such a Mill. theory. The fact is, the teaching of Scripture is decisive of such a time and rule coming, and it is equally decisive in giving no such time and rule between the First and Sec. Advents. It follows, therefore, that in accord with primitive teaching and the scriptural statements, it must follow the Sec. Advent.

Obs. 2. God, in view of the conditions of nature, and to exemplify His own power in constant impressions upon man, etc., does not produce the perfect fruit at once; His method of procedure, as seen in nature and in grace, embraces *an ascending scale*, the reaching of an intended goal by *preparatory* processes and means. This holds good in the matter of this Theocracy. Therefore, considering what God has done and is doing in

this direction, we may well expect *the ultimate completion* of His Plan in actual manifestation. Otherwise, if God is not again to be manifested in union with an earthly Ruler—yea, as Kurtz and others, is not to stoop to become an earthly Ruler Himself—what avails, and how are we to understand, the interest that God *has once taken* in earthly government. Has that interest failed, or, is the highest of all earthly powers, that of government, to be cast aside as unworthy of God's continued and special interest? If this is so, then, indeed, earth will never witness a perfect government, simply because such is human imperfection, the depravity of man, the deceitfulness of power and corresponding wealth, etc. (as evidenced down to the Advent itself in wars, rumors of war, etc.), that the help—direct—of heaven *is requisite* to lift the government of the race upon a higher plane. The Kingdom of the Son of Man is *alone* the hope of the world.

Obs. 3. The reign of this Son of Man strictly in accordance with the covenant, and the union of the saints with Him in such a rule, *will alone satisfy the cravings of humanity for a strong and most blessed government*, which shall break down forever the opposing, clashing interests of nations, dispel their jealousies, and unite them, freed from evils, under one common, visible, and accessible Head. Then humanity, both in Christ and His saints, exalted and placed beyond the evils inherent in the present life, still sympathetic and desirous to bless, will proceed to the work of elevating man, not merely in his individual, but likewise in his social, national, and universal life. Then that which the heathen Zeno faintly painted, as a longing or earnest desire of his heart, will be abundantly verified, viz., that "men should not be separated by cities, states, and laws, but that all should be considered as fellow-citizens and partakers of one life, and that the whole world like a united flock should be governed by one common law." Plutarch (*Lives, Alex.* i. c. 6) vainly thought that Alexander's conquest of nations and uniting them in one general empire was a fulfilment of Zeno; and others besides Plutarch idly dream of such a consummation *outside of the covenanted line* of procedure; but all such forget, that unless a power can be exerted over depraved nature to restrain or save it, and over nature itself to restore it in harmony with such a government, its stability will be like Alexander's. The Bible places our hope, and the gratification of the longings of depressed man, in the Coming again of this Son of Man and the establishment of His Kingdom, for He is the rightful heir to whom it belongs, and the One for whom alone it is designed by the Father.

The simple faith even of the heathen Virgil condemns the belief of some professed believers, when he speaks of the "God-like Child" that shall rule a reconciled world, and of "the golden race" that shall arise, uttering the prayer: "Begin to assume, I pray, your sovereign honor, majestic Child. See the world nodding with its ponderous vaults and lands and planes of sea—see how all things exult in the age to come."

Obs. 4. Accepting the phraseology of Ullman, Neander, and others, that "Christianity is Christ developing Himself in humanity," we add—to perfect the idea—*for the purpose of its future visible manifestation in Him and His saints in behalf of the race in an exhibited perfect government*, the highest and most honorable position in which it can be placed. Now the connection with humanity is only preparative; then it will be operative on a scale that insures Redemption *in all* the relations of society and life.

So also, keeping the covenants before us, we receive the idea "that Christ is God-man in so far as He represents in His own Person the perfect unity of the human and the divine," but we add to complete the picture: which representation, now accepted by faith and made necessary by covenant and promise, *shall in due time be practically evidenced in His return and Theocratic reign*, thus forming the perfect means for the accomplishment of a perfect end. Reference is thus made to these things, because the great design (without discarding others) intended by this very God-manship, viz., *to qualify Him for His covenanted reign on the Theocratic throne*, is by many left entirely out of sight, as if it were not an important and distinguishing feature of the Divine Purpose, while from the covenant standpoint *it is most essential.* Admitting, as nearly all do, that in Him at His Sec. Coming we find a perfect God-man, such as the covenanted mercies describe, we have only—as appertaining to the highest glory of David's Son—to take another step by admitting His reign and Kingdom, and thus find *the perfect earthly Kingdom* which the Bible describes. The one stands *related to* the other; the latter is *a resultant* of the former.

Obs. 5. Taking into consideration the ardent desire expressed by the prophets, that this God-man should show Himself and reign in a glorious manner—or the longings of the heathen, in fact including almost all men, that the Divine might interfere to remove the present disturbing elements, and introduce a reign of peace and blessedness—we may well ask in view of such an almost universal desire, expressed in all religions and entertained in all ages, whether, judging from the expressed wishes of man, enlightened and unenlightened, it is not a fact that *the highest possible position* in which we can place the Kingdom of God in its relation to humanity, is that of regarding it as a State or Empire, Theocratic Universal, over the earth, founded, governed and developed under direct personal divine authority, personally manifested, *thus constituting a perfectly reliable and infallible Head and Rule?* Infidelity now objects to the Word on the ground of such a desirable Theocratic rule not being manifested, but overlooks the Record which *promises it*, to supply a great need. It is singular, and certainly worthy of reflection, that God's Plan of Government falls within the line of man's wishes, if we will only receive the covenants, prophets and apostles *in their true grammatical sense.* Judging then simply from a long-felt and expressed want in the world, which has excited the desires alluded to, it seems *eminently suitable* for just such a Kingdom under the Son of Man, as is predicted, to be established on earth. With it, any one can readily see how the Redemptive process, embracing not merely individuals but the nations and the race, can be carried on until it culminates into completed Redemption.

Treatises, tracts, books have appeared from age to age indicative of the desirableness of a change in the condition of things, and proposing plans by which, at least, it might be ameliorated. The advocacy of a Congress of Nations, a Universal Code of Laws, a General Confederation under a Central Head, a Union of Church and State, the paramount and pre-eminent claims of this and that church as a Leader, the general adoption of Republicanism, Education, Philosophy, etc., are all based on the desire to realize in some form or other such a position. The history of the past and present plainly shows the sad deficiency in the highest of human relations, that of government. Man's nature and will have too often made human government the engine of spoliation, oppression, war, cruelty, and grievous wrong; and the very best are far from being free of injustice, corruption, and bloodshed. History, with its multitudes of attesting facts of weakness and

depravity, causes us to adopt, in view of the precious hope of deliverance set before us, Dr. Bonar's language : " Weary of man's rule, we long for God's." In the Church itself, in view of the differences, dissensions, divisions, etc., who has not longed for an infallible head, teacher, and guide, seeing that the most pious and devoted are thus separated both in doctrine, practice, and government. Our hope is in the Second Coming of One in whom is lodged all power and wisdom.

Obs. 6. The student of the Word will not fail to notice, that God's idea of a perfect government embraces the union of Church and State, as exhibited in the Theocratic ordering.. But this, in order to be effectual, must be under *an infallible Divine* Headship. In the hands of mortal, fallible men it is only conducive to evil (as history attests), but in the guidance of God directly it is productive of good and happiness. (Comp. Props. 154, 155, 205, etc.)

The most eminent men have advocated, as the highest possible development, the union of Church and State, both forming one, as e.g. Rothe (comp. his *Life*, by Nippold). Dr. Arnold (*Life of*, by Stanley, vol. 2, p. 103), in a letter to Bunsen, says : " Connected with this is Rothe's book, which I have read with great interest. His first position—that the State and not the Church (in the common and corrupt sense of the term), is the perfect form under which Christianity is to be developed—entirely agrees with my notions." The manner of realization, through the agency of " the Christ," has been given by us in detail. Men have sought this realization *before* the time, and through *human* agency, and the result (comp. e.g. Baptist Noel's *Essay on the Union of Church and State*, and others) has always proven baneful and one-sided. While, therefore, it is right and proper to oppose such a union, as a virtual forestalling of God's own ordering and as a mere caricature of His Plan, because of its invariable painful consequences, it is an extreme, on the other hand, to assert (as the Scottish Church, D'Aubigne's *Germ., Eng., and Scotland*, p. 158) that it never ought to be accomplished (basing it on the passage, " My Kingdom is not of this world," comp. Prop. 109), for this is opposed to God's ultimate Purpose. Some writers, totally misapprehending the Theocratic idea, when speaking of the Millennial Kingdom make (as Baldwin in *Armageddon*, p. 48), in their imaginative Republicanism, disunion the great feature, saying : " The disunion of Church and State is the great prophetic epoch of liberty and progress according to both Daniel and St. John." The deep thinkers, the scholars, conclude very differently, and find that such a union is requisite to insure the highest happiness of man and society. It would be interesting and highly instructive if some student would trace out this union of Church and State, and how men attempted its realization down to the present. Such a history would have an abundance of material to draw from, starting with the Theocratic idea and its sad perversions in the past. It could e.g. show what has taken place during the Christian era ; how in the early centuries there was no union of Church and State, but the Church kept in view its mission and the design of this dispensation, gathering out a people for His name ; how under Constantine a union was effected, and its disastrous results ; how the Romish Church incorporated and extended this idea, claiming, however, in itself both religious and civil supremacy ; how Protestants retained the idea either in full, or attempted a compromise by defining the rights of the Church and the rights of the State ; how the extreme views were entertained making the State God's Kingdom (the King His Vicegerent) and the Church a form of the State and under its guidance, or declaring both to be essentially one with equal rights ; how modifications of these arose running from the Territorial (Erastian) idea down to that of a mere protectorate, or voluntary union. Some of the most fearful wars and terrible crimes of humanity have sprung from *this fatal and sad perversion* of the Theocratic idea, costing multitudes of lives, millions of treasure, and incalculable suffering. When men ignore God's Plan and mode of fulfilment, and attempt to make their own and realize it, the consequences, owing to human weakness and depravity, are *always disastrous*, no matter how good the men, or sincere the motives, originating them. Under the specious idea of honoring God and exalting Christ, man has been crushed under a despotism, which persecuted to the death. The blood of many, many martyrs still keeps up the unceasing cry, "*How long, O Lord.*"

PROPOSITION 203. *The exaltation of the Christ is not lessened or lowered by thus referring the promises of the Kingdom to an outward manifestation in the future.*

If we say that Christ will do what Jehovah previously (Prop. 200, Obs. 10) performed, this *cannot lower* Him. In making the Messiah to do the Will of the Father, whatever that Will may be, we *honor* Him. In saying that Jesus will fulfil the covenants sealed and attested to by His blood, we *exalt* Him. In placing Him ultimately on the restored Theocratic-Davidic throne and Kingdom, and through the same exerting an universal dominion, we *honor and exalt* His humanity, as David's Son and Heir, without diminishing or detracting from His divine nature or the Divine Sovereignty, He may, in virtue of the divine, wield with the Father. What is divine ever belongs to Him, and while employed in the Theocratic order, is not bounded by His rule as the Son of Man.

Obs. 1. The objection intimated in the Proposition against our doctrine, proceeds from a one-sided view of the Person of Christ, exalting the divine as if exclusive, and leaving out the human as if it were *no longer* a factor in Redemption. We are afraid that those who are engaged in lauding and magnifying Christ until in their laudations the divine is made to swallow up or absorb the human, under the impression that they are honoring Jesus, will find themselves *seriously mistaken* when God the Father reveals Himself, through that Son, as a covenant-keeping God. Such *practically ignore* David's Son, and *thus degrade* Him. (1) By denying His present continued Davidic relationship; (2) and by refusing to believe that the covenant promises can only be realized through David's Son.

As the objection that we lower Christ in advocating such a Kingdom and reign is offensively paraded in numerous works (men thus presuming to set themselves up as the judges respecting what it is right and proper for Jesus to do in this matter), and as it undoubtedly has impressed sincere and pious hearts *with prejudice* against us, it is suitable that attention is called to this subject. Well-meaning persons, unable to discriminate between the general Divine Sovereignty and this specially covenanted Theocratic Kingdom, etc., may honestly entertain such an opinion to our discredit, but those who know the foundation of this reigning, its Theocratic nature, its glorious results, etc., will be slow to receive it. Really so sensitive, apparently, are some writers on this point, and so pressingly insist upon the force of the objection that the writer has sometimes wondered that in the excess of zeal and theory they have not combated the incarnation and death of Jesus as *a degradation* of the divine. Surely if the Christ came, in the covenanted way, as a babe—if He died on the cross after a life of humiliation—is it unreasonable or a lowering of Him to expect His return in great power and glory, and to anticipate a reign which only shows Him forth as the Mighty Redeemer and the King of kings. (Comp. also Props. 182, 183, 196, 197, etc., which serve to remove current prejudice.)

Obs. 2. In exalting Jesus as "the Son of Man," in His descent from David, in His proper covenanted humanity, we, as a corresponding result,

honor the divine which is *inseparably united* with it. The simple biblical truth is, that in bringing forth the covenanted King, seated as the Son of Man on the throne of His glory, attention is directed to *the distinctive covenanted Christ*, who is then engaged in fulfilling the *oath-bound promises* of the Father. What position greater or more honorable than this! Certainly we *cannot degrade* the Saviour when we make His humanity (as well as the divine), as the Bible does, a continued and most important factor in the progressive work of Redemption, actively and visibly engaged in its accomplishment (comp. Props. 81–85 and 196–202).

Obs. 3. Regarding the Incarnation as part of the continuous unfolding of the Divine Purpose, especially in reference to this very Kingdom, we certainly exalt it, when showing *how necessary and indispensable* it continues to be in order to carry out that Purpose as contained in the covenants and revealed by the prophets. That is, the Theocratic ordering as covenanted, and which is so admirably adapted to meet the longings and remove the burdens of a groaning humanity, cannot possibly be realized (Prop. 120) without the Advent of the King and the resultant reign. But He comes and reigns as "Son of Man," as David's Son (Props. 49, 81 and 122).

Obs. 4. This reign of the Son of Man, including the fulfilment of God's pledged Word and the Salvation of a world, is invariably represented in Scripture as not only *a constant source* of gladness and exultation in those who participate in its blessings, but of praise, honor, and glory to Christ and the Father. Read the Millennial descriptions of this covenanted Kingdom, and they are full of passages expressive of *the great glory* awaiting the Son of David when He enters upon His Theocratic reign. Surely then when the Spirit, knowing the things of the future, leads thus in honoring the Christ when ascribing to Him this future reign, *we cannot mistake* in following His guidance.

Sometimes these references of the Spirit are presented under such a figurative garb that their full force can only be appreciated by close attention. Thus e.g. Isa. 4 : 2, which many able commentators (comp. Barnes, *loci*) and others apply (as also *Chaldee Parap.*) to the Messiah—some to His human nature, others to the human and divine combined—and, however to be understood in detail, is highly expressive of His glory, it being declared that He "*shall be beauty and glory*" (Alexander's ver. "*be for honor and for glory*"), "*excellent and comely*" (Barnes, "*for exaltation and ornament*," Alex. vers. "*for sublimity and beauty*"). That is, He shall be the chief, great object that shall give honor, distinction, splendor, and glory to this period of the world. It is suggested to the critical reader that the phrase "the fruit of the earth"—which is by many critics referred to the human nature of Christ, and by others simply to express in Hebrew parallelism the same meaning embraced in the first member "the Branch of the Lord" (which some think denotes the divine nature, i.e. the Offspring of the Lord, the Son of God, and others believe is expressive of the human nature, the Branch of David raised up through the power of the Lord or pertaining to the Lord) may include in it, as descriptive of the Christ, a reference to His resurrection, being raised up out of the earth, etc.

Obs. 5. This reign of David's Son and Lord, presents to us here on earth a realization of *that yearning* after a perfected humanity which has characterized man's history. This earnest longing is found in the oldest systems of religion in various phases, especially in the man elevated gods of Greece and Rome, and extends down into the modern worship of humanity and its ideal personification. This reveals a deep feeling that

humanity not only itself needs and aspires after elevation, but also the hope that *in some form or other* this will be attained. Now certainly we *honor* this expressed desire, and more particularly the Personage by and through whom it is to be realized. Our doctrine, in beautiful simplicity and consistency, holds forth a Redeemed humanity *in the very place* where the longings for such Redemption were so universally expressed ; and any such fulfilment, in the nature of the case (as in the preciousness and magnitude of the work performed, the deliverance from the curse, etc.), must largely contribute *to the glory of the One* through whom it is accomplished. The Incarnation was, and is now, most essential to carry out the Divine Purpose ; it is in fact *the covenanted grand means* introduced to work out salvation, and the work happily and provisionally begun will be completed. This is clearly seen both from the Scriptures and the great stress that is laid upon it in the most able systems of divinity. But our faith, gratefully acknowledging *the inestimable work* already performed by this humanity, looks forward to *a still greater* (for it embraces *perfect deliverance and eternal glory*), one scripturally ascribed to it (as "*the Son of Man*") when salvation is to be *completed* through His Sec. Advent. If the humanity is now exalted in view of the past, will this not be equally true because of its *future continued participation* in the Redemptive Plan. Gratefully, most reverently do we receive the fact that the humanity of Christ materially aids—in its Theocratic position—to *the perfecting* of the glorious work, seeing that in its visible accomplishment and finished aspects, it is something specially committed to Him as "*the Son of Man.*" Hence, in holding up this future reign of this Son of Man, we honor and exalt Him as "*the Son of Man*" and in Him Redeemed Humanity.

It is a singular and noteworthy fact that, as recently insisted on both by believers in Christianity and some of its opponents, the idea of incarnation is "a want," "a necessity" fully recognized by man in all ages. It seems a providential movement that as the Coming of the Son of Man approaches, there should arise on all sides *a renewed and marvellous interest* in the Incarnation itself. While Christian writers dwell upon it as a leading factor in the work of redemption, and draw arguments from it to show the adaptation of the Christian religion to human nature, the accessibility of the Godhead through it, the relationship it sustains to divine law, to the Plan of Redemption, and to the race of man—on the other hand, many liberal and unbelieving writers enlarge upon it in such a way, that, without denying in direct terms the Incarnation of Christ, they detract from its exclusive Christian or biblical relationship by endeavoring to show how the doctrine of Incarnation is a prime element in other religions. Instead of concluding how this only evinces the desire of man to have God communicate Himself personally through humanity as through an accessible and satisfactory Mediumship adapted to man, the latter conclude that since the yearning is not confined to the Christian religion, the doctrine of the Incarnation is a legitimate deduction of reason resulting from a felt "want," but endeavor to weaken its force by making it indicative of a sort of pantheistic relation to man, which is found, more or less, in all men. Some recent writers (as e.g. Goodwin, *Christ and Humanity*, 1875) while making Jesus "the archetypal man" and the incarnation of the divine, even speak (like Kingsley's *Hypatia*) of its pre-existence, as a sort of anticipative development or illustration of the divine idea. However vitiated as all these theories may be by a refined pantheistic tendency, by the assumption of a divine common in all men but more strikingly and profusely exhibited in Jesus, by a complete ignoring of the Theocratic Plan and its essential requirement in the Person of the Theocratic King, yet in all of them it is fully admitted that the Incarnation is "a necessity"—something required in behalf of humanity. The discussion as it progresses in numerous able works, evinces *the paramount importance* attached to the doctrine. It clearly and unmistakably reveals that man—and includes the deepest thinkers and most profound reasoners—feels the necessity of Deity assuming, or in some way identifying Himself with, humanity in order to secure elevation and accessibility unto Him ; that, in some form, it is a bridging over of the chasm now existing between the finite and the infinite ; that it

is essential for God to be thus manifested in order to enable us to comprehend Him, and through His aid to experience salvation from evil. A recent Liberal writer (Johnson, *Oriental Religions*, 483) candidly acknowledges this, affirming that it is requisite to religious sentiment, although exhibited in various phases ; that philosophy affirms—the heart pleads—the disciples of every positive religion insist—and the devout thinker says : "It must be so—it is so." Discarding the pantheistic notions derived from this fact (as utterly antagonistic and fatal to covenant and fulfilment) as unwarranted and opposed to the truth, we accept of this general, if not universal, feeling as a proof that a want so intensely felt and expressed, so thoroughly incorporated with religions, and so vividly delineated by philosophy as essential, *is fully and perfectly met* by the incarnation of "the Christ," but expressly—which, alas ! so many totally overlook—in His openly manifested Theocratic position and reign. May every reader deeply ponder this inexpressibly precious and elevating truth. We only add that a Theocratic Plan so complete, so admirably adapted (according to the numerous concessions of unbelief), to meet the wants of a burdened humanity, could not possibly be evolved by "ignorant fishermen," seeing that the essentials of a Plan for Redemption are identical with those that *the highest reason* affirms must be requisite factors in a satisfactory and perfect work.

Obs. 6. In the Judgeship of Christ, in His august Kingship, we make "*the Man ordained*" just as the Bible does, *the central figure, the culminating point* in the salvation realized in this Kingdom, without discarding or lessening the divine united with Him. In the Humanity of the Seed of Abraham and David manifested in the Theocratic order, we have heaven and earth united, indicated by the predicted ascending and descending angels ; we have the otherwise invisible God dwelling with man (shown by the prophecies of Isaiah, John, etc.) bestowing the Adamic blessings once forfeited by sin ; and we have man and the earth restored to the goal originally intended. In this reign we have the earthly brought up to the level of the heavenly, so that God's will is done on earth as in heaven, and the world, redeemed from the torturing power of the curse, exults in more than Paradisiacal blessings. Surely *in all this we honor the Son and the Father ;* we exalt and magnify in their ample and veritable realization "*the everlasting Covenant.*" Let no one, on this ground, censure us for returning to the early Church doctrine, in which is advocated, that finally, at the Second Advent of the Son of Man, David's Son, the longing of ages, the feeling of the successive generations after a revealed Incarnation of God—openly manifested in regal power—will be fully realized ; not in the now vain effort of man to find it in man himself as an outgrowth of Deity, not in the finding of God in nature and hence in man as the highest exhibition of nature, but in *the Man, Jesus*, in and through whom the Father is seen, in and through whom perfected man is beheld, and in and through whom man is elevated to the dignity of a recognized sonship with God.

From all this the reader can judge the propriety of a writer speaking of "the low and paltry conceptions of Millenarians, which they have formed of the Sec. Advent," when we thus introduce and honor the fulfilment of the covenants, the faithfulness of the Father, the power and blessed reign of Jesus, the reign of the saints, the realization of a glorious dispensation, the removal of the curse, the rescue of the human race, the restoration and exaltation of the Jewish nation, the bestowal of Millennial blessedness. Dr. Berg (*Sec. Advent of Jesus Christ not Pre-Millennial*) declares that if Jesus thus returns and reigns it produces "a second humiliation," that He must "lay aside His glory," that He will dwell again "upon a sin-cursed earth" "amid scenes of sin, suffering, and death," etc. This is taking not merely a superficial, but a low, degrading view of Christ's inheritance, power, and glory. It is virtually degrading what the Scriptures eulogize in the highest possible terms ; it is ignoring the praises tendered, because of it, by the "great voices," Rev. 11 : 15–18, and 19 : 5, 6. On the other hand, Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2), advocating the Mill. Kingdom as entertained by us, says : "Such a manifestation we may not expect *before* the return of the Lord, but *after* this return we regard it—even

apart from the letter of Scripture—as on internal grounds, and, moreover, as *in the highest degree worthy of God.*'' Dr. Imbrie (*The Regeneration, Pre-Mill. Essays*, p. 159), after forcibly presenting our doctrine, asks: "And what now, in the presence of all this concurrent testimony, is the objection to this view so plainly written? The objection is, alas! that it is a carnal, earthly-minded view. Alas! Alas! Yes, says the objector, that plain meaning is just the view which the old Jews in Christ's time held. It is a carnal view, and as such was rebuked by Christ. How strangely must the plain declarations of Scripture lead astray, if this is the case! But the objection is unfounded. It is not a carnal view, nor was it ever rebuked by Christ. Is it carnal to look for the return of the Lord from heaven? or carnal to wish to see all the nations walking in holiness before the Lord? or to see Israel pre-eminent in holy service before the Lord? or all the earth like the garden of the Lord? What is meant by carnal? Does it mean that all this is associated with this earth, and, therefore, carnal? If this be meant, and if contact with the earth makes carnal, *then* Christ must have been carnal in living here; and Adam in his innocence carnal, simply because he lived in Eden on earth. But the earth was made good by God; and the renewed earth will speak His praise as the dwelling-place of His people." A careful scrutiny of the Word shows that the only carnality that Jesus and the Apostles rebuke is that which utterly unfits man for this Theocratic Kingdom, to have part in the first res., the reign, and the renewed earth. With the Jew it is that adhesion to the flesh which causes him to believe that as Abraham's child he will, without repentance and faith, without having Abraham's God-fearing and loving spirit, be heir of this Kingdom; with the Gentile it is that subserviency to the flesh that it causes him to hope that, without a change of heart, without a forsaking of sin and a cleaving to holiness, he can enter this Kingdom. Such carnality is steadily, unswervingly censured, denounced, and condemned. But that which redeems and exalts humanity, which delivers the creature and elevates the world, which evidences the power and preciousness of Redemption, which contributes to the praise and glory of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is the very opposite of carnality, and those who, ignorantly or wilfully, mistake the one for the other misapply the most ravishing promises of the Scriptures.

PROPOSITION 204. *Such a view of the Kingdom gives definiteness and a continued exaltation to the human nature of Christ, and indicates the majestic relationship that it sustains throughout the ages to the race of man.*

Our doctrine of the Kingdom covenanted to David's Son, to be manifested at the Sec. Advent, (1) *makes much* of the humanity of Jesus, the same humanity derived at His birth in David's line, and necessarily continued as such—subject only to glorification to qualify it the more for its ever-enduring position—conditioned by the covenants and promises. It distinctively embraces the Coming Son of Man as David's Son and Lord, and definitely attributes to His human nature its just and ever-sustained covenant relationship to David. (2) In virtue of this, and His receiving the Kingdom of covenant, and ruling over it as such a Son of Man, *His Headship* over the race as *the Second Adam* is also fully recognized and confirmed. (Comp. Prop. 82.) (3) This opens before us the sublime view of Christ's *majestic relationship* during the coming ages to the race of man and the world.

Obs. 1. If the Incarnation was the medium through which (John 14 : 9) the Father is manifested to men, *will it not continue* to be so at Christ's "appearing and Kingdom ;" if it was the most stupendous fact in the history of the world, *will it not remain such* and become *evermore* remarkable (because of blessings received through it), in its continued manifestation in a glorified form in the future Kingdom belonging to it by Divine prerogative ; if the moral purposes, involving principles of law and government, enshrouded in and flowing from it, make it the wonder of men and angels, the object of joy and admiration, *will it not ever continue to be such* when specially held up to the gaze of heaven and earth in its exalted Kingly position of David's successor attaining world-wide dominion ; if it is related to, and identified with, salvation, and comes to perfect that salvation, *will it ever be less related and identified* when it ennobles and enthrones humanity by union with it in the covenanted manner of the Kingdom? No ! the Incarnate God, the Redeeming Man, the Divine-human, the Seed of Abraham and David, the Theocratic King, forever remains *the same distinctive Jesus*, who in His predicted Kingly office as the Covenanted Ruler proclaims and exerts His Redemptive power over the whole world.

Obs. 2. This is in direct contrast with the prevalent theory, which makes the human nature very prominent in the life and death of Jesus, less so after His ascension, and still less after the judgment day. Indeed after the latter period it seems to occupy *a very subordinate* position and has

lost in a manner *its significancy and value.* Even such an able writer as Neander discards "all earthly relations" pertaining to Davidic descent after the resurrection.[1] Departing from *the plain teaching* of the covenants and predictions, these theologians profess that nothing is known or stated respecting its position after this epoch, and stress alone is laid on the divine nature. This attitude evinces *a serious defect;* for it is scarcely conceivable that an Incarnation so intimately connected, and represented as perpetually blended, with the Redemption of man, is to be considered, at any time in the future, as occupying *a less important relationship to man or the dignity and honor of Jesus.* A retrogression is unreasonable and derogatory to "*the Christ;*" *once Theocratic King, He ever remains such* —for from the express teachings of the covenants, prophets, apostles, and Jesus Himself, we must believe (as has in detail been shown) that its most glorious manifestation, in behalf of happiness and glory, *is yet in the future after His Coming as "the Son of Man."*

[1] It might be regarded as invidious to quote from the writings of men whom the author highly esteems, and who themselves love and honor Jesus. It is sufficient, however, to establish our position by referring to works of Sys. Div., which distinctively teach that the rule of Jesus, *as the Son of Man*, shall end (comp. Prop. 159). This involves that ultra subordination and consequent ignoring of the humanity. Thus e.g. Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 352) asserts: "It appears that the government which Christ *as a Man* administers in heaven, will continue only while the present constitution of the world lasts. At the end of the world, when the heavenly state commences, the government which Christ administers *as a Man* shall cease," etc.

Obs. 3. The subordinate (necessarily owing to the Theocratic ordering being founded on the divine sovereignty of the Father) condition of the human nature of Christ in the future ages is presented in the interpretation of 1 Cor. 15 : 24 (which is examined and applied under Prop. 159). In accordance with the almost general exposition of this passage, while indeed in the minds of many there is a rejection of the idea of a removal, or putting off, or annihilation of the human nature, yet, those who receive it are forced to make it consist in its laying aside some of its honor, or dignity, or position, or power, in a withdrawal from a Kingdom over the Redeemed (although some still insist that somehow "the Christ" reigns but indefinitely expressed or referred to the divine nature), or in its occupying a lower grade of prominency, being swallowed up or overshadowed by the divine. In all this there is a vagueness and a lack of consistency, as well as a lowering (unintentional) of the majesty of Christ as David's Son, saddening to witness. On the other hand, our argument, fortified step by step with God's own Word, insists upon *the continued, undiminished exaltation* of the human nature of Jesus *in its Kingly office*, not only because of its inseparable union with the divine and its requisition to constitute "the Christ," but because *in no other way* can the covenants and promises be realized, the efficacy of the Second Adamship be shown, and the perfection of Redemption be exhibited. We advocate not merely the eternal glorification of the human nature, but its future revelation and the presentation to it (Props. 81–84) of the actual visible Sovereignty of the world, from which it is never displaced, as will be seen when we speak of the perpetuity (Prop. 159) of the Kingdom.

Obs. 4. Considering the highly important part that this human nature of Jesus *has yet to perform* in the scheme of Redemption and in the

history of the world, it is *a sad defect* in those learned and valuable works relating to the life and Person of "*the Christ*" (as e.g. Neander's, Ullman's, Lange's, Dorner's, etc.), that they confine themselves *almost exclusively* to the First Advent, to the intermediate period in heaven, and to the present dispensation in order to assign the reasons why that humanity was taken, and to describe the results that shall flow from it. The Sec. Advent with its accompaniments, while stated in part, is represented as divine, and the continued Humanity and its work for the ages is either passed by or dismissed with a few general remarks. Ignoring *the covenants in their plain grammatical sense*, overlooking that the future Kingdom *is specifically promised to the Son of Man*, the most majestic and magnificent period, associated with the Person of the Christ, is left unnoticed, notwithstanding the decided references to His relationship to the Kingdom after His Sec. Advent in the character of David's Son. In their estimation of the Christ, the divine so preponderates that it virtually places Him in a position directly opposed to the covenants; *the distinctive Christ* is lost in the divine; *the rule of David's Son* is utterly absorbed in that of God alone; and the Divine Sovereignty is mistaken for the *specially covenanted dominion* offered and bestowed upon the Seed of David. Alas! how able men desiring to honor "the Christ," unintentionally reduced the glory pertaining to Him.

Obs. 5. Some systems of theology, rightfully apprehending the importance of the Incarnation in the Plan of Redemption, and impressed by the great stress laid upon it in Holy Writ, endeavor to rescue it from the neglected or one-sided position into which it had fallen, but are themselves led, by ignoring *its covenanted relationship* to the Kingdom, into another extreme, viz., that the Incarnation in some mystical but real manner is transfused into every believer. This is virtually a transformation of believing men into so many subordinated Christs.[1] The Christ as God-man is not transfused into others in His incarnated capacity, for this is opposed alike to Revelation, specific covenant and experience. The oneness, union, fellowship, etc., of believers with Christ, however intimate, does not require this, for, as the Bible explains itself, this oneness, etc., consists in the members *being made like unto the Head* morally (i.e. possess same characteristics, same mind or spirit, etc.), and finally through the power of the resurrection, a likeness of glorified form. This theory, honorable to the idea of Incarnation, is defective since we must *await* the Sec. Advent to realize (even in resurrection power and Theocratic rule) the practical relationship that the humanity of Jesus sustains to the race as a race in the form of the covenanted blessings, which can only now be *anticipated* by faith and hope.

[1] This theory is tersely and forcibly stated by Rev. S. Miller (*Treat. on Mercersburg Theol.*, p. 24, etc.) as one in which believers at present "partake of Christ's humanity." For the feeling which seeks to exalt the humanity of Jesus we have high respect, but object to the philosophical (after the Hegelian school) manner in which it is incorporated, and which, stripped of its surroundings, resolves itself into a very refined Christianized Pantheism. (Comp. Dr. Dorner's criticism of Rev. Miller's work.) This view is also seriously defective because (1) it too much spiritualizes the covenants; (2) it ignores the relation that the Incarnation sustains to the covenanted Kingdom (applying it to the present Church, etc.); (3) it greatly applies to the present time promises relating to the future; (4) it overlooks that the power of the resurrection and an exaltation in this Kingdom are requisite to secure a likeness to Jesus, such as is contained in many

promises. Beautiful and attractive as the theory is to some minds, it is likewise opposed to Christian experience, seeing that the consciousness of believers only attests to a moral work wrought in the heart, while the body may be sinking into decay under the curse. Redemption for the whole man is only promised through the resurrecting power of Jesus.

Obs. 6. Passing by as utterly unworthy of reply the coarse attacks on the Incarnation, it is proper to pause and notice, briefly, another and more insidious one. A modern party, rejecting the denial of the Supernatural and willing in some form to receive the doctrine, arrays itself in professed garments of light, and with plausible words, claims the Incarnation as "the law of universal humanity—the identical oneness of God and man," and proceeds on this hypothesis *to absorb* not only Christ, but all men into "*the Absolute.*" This with some modifications, but Pantheistic withal, is eloquently interwoven into various theological systems and introduced into some church histories.[1] The result is that Incarnation is represented as a progressive work, and which finally results in swallowing up the individuality into "the Absolute." The vaguest of dreams, deemed sublime, are substituted for the plain biblical doctrine, and instead of *the covenanted Humanity* in its future manifested position and glory, we are lost and dazzled in speculations concerning "the Absolute." The biblical conception, simple and grand in its Theocratic ordering, is very diverse from the mystical and philosophical conceptions adverted to; the one brings God as a Person, a Ruler, occupied in blessing man, near to man—the other diffuses God among men and leaves an indistinct conception to stand for God; the one presents in simple terms a Theocratic King in the form of man produced by Supernatural union of the two natures, in all respects adapted to secure the welfare of man—the other places this Theocratic ordering in the race of men, which, in connection with all other things, in its aggregate forms a kind of Pantheistic, Impersonal God, with none of the necessary requisites to meet the heart, longings, practical wants, etc., of a suffering humanity.

[1] Comp. also the transmission of Christ's incarnation to His followers by the French critical school (as e.g. Reville and others) in that God reveals Himself in, and identifies Himself with, every man who receives the truth as they understand it. Theo. Parker (*Dis. on Matters Per. to Relig.*, p. 478) extends this, saying: "The divine incarnation is in all mankind." The Hegelian philosophy first systematized this incarnation idea and by having a God manifested primarily through man and secondarily through nature, it was easy to resolve all things into "the Absolute," and to have "the Absolute" exhibiting Himself in all things. Writers of this description are exceedingly fond of a high-sounding verbiage profusely given, but which convey anti-scriptural ideas.

Another extreme is presented by Lincoln (*Lects. on the Epis. of St. John*, p. 120), who repudiates as an error "that the Lord Jesus coming into the world identified Himself with the human race. No! it was in death and resurrection He has got His people identified with Himself. Apart from death He has not reached us. And when they invent a religion which links Him in with us because He took human nature, they forget the fact that He was a holy man, and that we are not by nature holy men, but wretched sinners." Lincoln, in his eagerness to protect the results of Christ's mission to believers (which pertains to them who accept the truth in obedience) forgets (1) that the connection of Jesus with humanity is a real, actual one, being "a man," a descendant of David "according to the flesh;" (2) that this is an essential preliminary to the work of Redemption; (3) that this alliance will only be saving to those who acknowledge His claims, etc.; (4) that even believers, the most eminent, can bear no comparison to the purity and sinlessness of this Jesus. Hence his position is one-sided.

Obs. 7. Admitting that Christian philosophy has done much to heighten and advance the idea of Incarnation as a necessary and indispensable

adjunct to Redemption, yet such a philosophy has too often taken a low and one-sided view of *the practical results* of the Incarnation. The simple fact is, that the philosophical truth lying at the basis of the Incarnation is found not merely in the provision made for our salvation in the birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of this Jesus, but in the bestowal of the covenanted requirements in order that He might be properly constituted Theocratic King, and in what that humanity has yet to perform, in fulfilment of covenanted promises, in the ages to come. To view only what has been done and what is now progressing, is to see one side of the truth ; but to look in addition at what shall be done in the future, and to combine these, is to grasp *the whole truth*. Consequently any theorizing respecting the Incarnation which leaves out the greater part of the design contemplated, the most honorable purpose intended by it (and distinctly announced in the covenant) must necessarily prove defective.

That is, it confines itself too much to the present dispensation and to the relieving of spiritual wants, and overlooks the grand work to be performed hereafter. This is even seen in the positive ignoring of a still future Kingdom pertaining to "the Christ," and of the Redemptive work exercised over man and Creation during that period. Hence Seiss (*Apoc.*, p. 73) justly observes: "It is a mischievous error to suppose that the Son of God's assumption of human nature was only for the immediate private end of redeeming fallen man—a mere phenomenon in Godhead's ever busy administration—a simple act the like of which may have been before, or may be again. *It is the abiding miracle of eternity.* It is, and was meant to be, a thing of abiding permanence, the eternal continuity of which is as vital to the everlasting future of the redeemed, and the great purposes of God, as the continuity of creative power is to the preservation of the universe."

Obs. 8. The quite early Church (during the Chiliastic period) preserved a strictly logical and consistent attitude respecting the humanity of Christ. This arose from ever keeping in view *its covenanted aspect* and insisting upon its ever retaining the same in the Theocratic rule. It is sometimes alleged that the apostles, and their immediate successors, had no philosophy or scientific skill in presenting truth, but as the conflict between false philosophy and Christianity, between false science and religion, goes on, the most profound thinkers begin to see and to confess that they exhibited a correct philosophical knowledge and a real scientific, logical spirit, when they state as leading facts, and ever keep in view as fundamental axioms, that Revelation is the only source of all truth which immediately concerns Redemption ; that the covenants of God will be realized just as recorded in that Revelation ; and that David's Son, in connection with the Divine inseparably united with Him, is the appointed instrumentality by which all will be accomplished. Sound philosophy must run in the channel that God has indicated, i.e. *in the covenanted way*, and then it can both decidedly and forcibly bring the Divine and human into an intimate and living relation, and show how deliverance to man and creation is to be effected.

This adhesion to the covenanted Person of "the Messiah" gives us a clew not only to their defence of the Person of Christ against the attacks levelled in opposition to the humanity on the one hand, and to the divine on the other, but to the fact, noticed by Neander, that the Chiliasts were exceedingly hostile to the Gnostics. Thus e.g. Neander (*Ch. His.*, p. 362) says that while Justin opposed the false Jewish notions, he was milder toward them than to the Gnostic sects. The reason is found in this : Gnosticism, less than these Jewish errorists, gave no distinctive features as covenanted to "the Christ," and hence allowed no fulfilment of the covenant as the sense demanded.

Obs. 9. Lecky and others endeavor to detract from the biblical statement of Redemption, its importance and greatness, because of the smallness of the earth compared with the universe.[1] This reiteration of an old objection, urged by Freethinking, has led others to make concessions (such as unduly pressing the Divine to the practical neglect of Christ's humanity, transplanting Christ's Kingdom and His saints to some central point of the universe, substituting the Divine Sovereignty over all worlds for a Theocracy adapted to the world, etc.) which are utterly unscriptural. The concessions reject the letter both of covenants and promises, and so spiritualize them that they may be applied or accommodated to an exalted position in the universe, *supposed* to be necessary by conceptions of the astronomical idea. But such an attitude is *highly injurious* to the truth and *derogatory* to the Son of Man. The Bible deals almost exclusively with this world—this earth, and not with others, or the universe. It is no treatise of astronomy, and it never professes that this earth is greater, or that it occupies a more important position in Creation than astronomy teaches and infers. The universe outside of the earth it leaves for the Divine Sovereignty to control, and only gives us glimpses of its vastness and of its being under subjection to the Almighty. But having reference to man, fallen and to be restored, and to creation, marred and to be renewed, it teaches us how Divine Sovereignty *in and through Man himself*, by a specially delegated Kingdom under "the ordained Man," i.e. David's Son, is to save man and restore him to a forfeited position in the moral government of God without any violation of the immutable principles of justice—is to renew all things, so that God's will shall be done on earth as in heaven.

[1] Lecky (Introd. to *Rationalism in Europe*) says: "The astronomical discovery that our world is not the centre and axis of the material universe, but is an inconsiderable planet occupying to all appearances an altogether insignificant and subordinate position, and revolving with many others around a sun which is itself but an infinitesimal point in creation, in as far as it is realized by the imagination, has a vast and palpable influence upon our theological conceptions." While Lecky introduces this objection, he exhibits his good taste by (*His. Rationalism*) saying: "Whatever may be thought of its justice, there cannot be two opinions about the exquisite beauty of the suggestion by which Dr. Chalmers sought to meet the difficulty—that the parable of the Shepherd leaving the ninety-nine sheep to seek that which had gone astray, is but a description of the act of the Deity seeking to reclaim the single world that had revolted against Him, as though it were of more importance than all that remained faithful." Figuier also (*The To-Morrow of Death*, p. 267) objects to the Bible confining itself so much to this earth and not embracing, in elucidations, purposes, etc., the entire universe, pronouncing it "that strange dogma in which, of the whole universe with its innumerable worlds, we see only the earth, know only the earth and its inhabitants—the earth, a paltry atom, lost in immensity—a grain of dust compared with the millions of globes with which space is filled." While admiring the faith of Figuier and others, which from pure inference swells the plurality of worlds to the highest scale accessible to the imagination (for it heightens the effect of the objection and is esteemed good writing), we certainly deplore the wrong attitude assumed by some (as e.g. by Whewell's *Essay on the Plurality of Worlds*) in attempting (vainly) to prove that religion, faith, and science are contrary to the doctrine of such a plurality. Comp. Chalmers's *Astron. Dis.*, Fontenelle's *Plurality of Worlds*, Dick's *Ch. Philos.*, Flammarion's *The Plurality of Inhabited Worlds*, Brewster's *More Worlds than One*, Huygens's *Cosmotheoros*, and others; also comp. Prop. 195. In the briefest manner it may be stated: (1) that the Bible is a book for man, and not for the inhabitants of other worlds, and hence is adapted only for man; (2) that the Bible reveals a redemptive process for the earth, and not for other planets or worlds, and therefore confines itself to this planet; (3) the Bible does not exclusively confine itself to this earth as if it were the only world existing, and it does not speak of it as if the earth were the centre, etc., of the universe, or even of a solar system (see Kurtz's *Astronomy*, Chal-

mers's *Astron. Dis.*, etc.) ; (4) the Bible so speaks that it implies the earth to be part of a general system, and which has been visited by beings from other worlds ; (5) the Bible begins with the fall of man and ends with his restoration to God's favor, and leaves the relationship that the world sustains to other worlds and to the universe at large, for future revelation ; (6) that if such a future relationship were plainly stated in detail, unbelievers, who now reject the statement of Jesus concerning the descending and ascending angels in the future, would be the first to deride it as improbable, etc. ; (7) that small as the world is in comparison with other planets, God, in His manifested love toward it, only exhibits the more strikingly His divine attributes in His condescension, care, mercy, etc., toward us to secure our happiness, etc. ; (8) that size is no criterion of beauty, special favor, etc., since the most beautiful forms and the most striking adaptations are found in the most minute objects evincing God's favor and provisions ; (9) the provision made for the earth in its Theocratic ordering being designed for the earth, has nothing whatever to do with God's Divine Sovereignty over the universe, or with any other (if such exist) modes of governing other planets ; (10) unacquainted as we are with the inhabitants, moral and civil regulations, etc., of other worlds, it is (*a*) unjust to depreciate the relation of the Bible to man by the institution of a comparison that only reveals *our ignorance*, and (*b*) it is *sufficient*, in view of our limited knowledge, to confine ourselves to the earth and its inhabitants with whom the Bible deals. Theologians who, in their wisdom, have made the future Kingdom over the earth the Divine Sovereignty of the Father and of the Son over the universe (instead of making it, as the Bible does, a Kingdom of "the Son of Man" supported and confirmed by the Divine Sovereignty, specially designed for man, and confined here to the earth, according to the oath-bound covenants of God) are alone chargeable with creating the difficulties drawn from astronomy. The Bible does not make them. In virtue of the vastness of creation, the Bible teaches us that it is a wonderful condescension, indicative of amazing love and mercy, to stoop to man and rescue him in the process of Redemption. It holds up to our admiration a Creator who, amid the vastness of creation, observes and cares for the sparrow. God's power is manifested through our weakness, and so His greatness and majesty is exhibited through our littleness, even as scientists say that God's love of beauty is witnessed in the snowflake or minute crystal, etc.

Obs. 10. We advance another step in showing that the very Theocratic ordering designed for the future in and through David's Son materially confirms the greatness of the universe, the plurality of worlds, and that this world is but a part of an extended system. The adoption of the Theocratic form, manifested in and through an "*ordained man*," clearly evidences that the earth is not supposed to be "the centre," etc., of the universe, for, as has been shown, the Divine Sovereignty lodged in the Father bestows (Props. 79–83) this Theocratic Kingdom upon David's Son, showing that this rule, intended for the earth, *is something separate and distinct* from (although supported by) the Divine Sovereignty which is exerted from the highest heaven. But this, while true, also shows, on the other hand, how this earth will again be reunited *in the closest fraternal relations* with the universe in virtue of the instituted Theocratic rule—a rule both adapted to this world and to bring this world into closer union with its God. Consider : the Bible is the Book of *man's Redemption*, beginning with man's fall and ending with his complete restoration here *on* the earth ; and, in delineating this, shows that when such Redemption is fully accomplished, then also will the Universe, obedient to God's sway, be brought into *unison* with this earth, and that *intercourse* (e.g. Prop. 157, etc.) between the two will be opened as originally intended. The presence of the mighty God in and through David's Son, while exalting and honoring the mercy, love, condescension, etc., of the Divine, while transfusing blessing, honor, and glory transcendently great even upon so comparative a small portion of creation as our earth—will also serve as *the firm and enduring basis of interchange* between this and other worlds.

Obs. 11. To indicate this continued exaltation and the majestic position of the Christ, it is only requisite to consider what has already been proven in detail, viz., that in this humanity is exhibited, as the early Church held, *in its Theocratic relationship*, the perfect union of the Divine with man without the Divine absorbing or lessening the same, so that the Son of Man, i.e. David's Son, forever remains such, and the Son of God, i.e. the Divine, forever continues such, *both combined constituting the Theocratic Christ.* This, aside from the covenanted necessity, the Theocratic ordering, etc., is clearly taught in the perpetuity (Prop. 159) of the Kingdom committed to Jesus as the Son of Man (Props. 81, 83), the covenanted Seed.

This Kingdom in its presentation of the King—Theocratic, God-King—unmistakably disproves the speculation of Fichte and others, viz., that it is impossible to atttribute to God personality, much less permanent union with human nature, without making Him a finite Being as ourselves. Aside from other reasons, the Theocratic form of government itself indicates and enforces the personality, etc., of the Ruler. By the reign of this Theocratic King, in that predicted Son of God and Son of Man order, will also be solved those problems which the great thinkers of the world have vainly endeavored, for ages, to elucidate, viz., those pertaining to the relations existing between the infinite and finite, the eternal and the temporal, God and man. The solution will be found *when* this Theocratic order is practically manifested and fully realized.

Obs. 12. While the Person of the Theocratic King, His official position, His attributes, the glorification of His humanity, the surroundings belonging to Him, the power exerted by Him, will all conduce to this elevation and grandeur; yet in addition to these the hearts of all will be influenced to love and serve this King because of the then fully appreciated (seeing that the blessings resulting therefrom are experienced in their highest measure) fact that *this "Anointed One," this present exalted Theocratic Ruler, died for us.* Redemption through His blood so exalts and fixes the affections of His associated kings and subjects upon Him that the prediction, in the love and praise of mankind, is realized of their being "*a willing people.*"

Obs. 13. The reign of "*the Man ordained*" *in the manner covenanted*, will most certainly bring to man the blessings promised. The miraculous power exhibited at the First Advent only typically shows the exertion of that power on *an immensely larger scale* at His Sec. Advent. Hence with the right and power lodged in Him, we are assured of *the full realization* of all that God has promised to man and the race. But with this assurance must be allied, as the basis of its certainty, that "the Man ordained" will only bring this to pass *in the predetermined, most solemnly covenanted, Theocratic-Davidic rule and Kingdom.* The covenant, just as it reads, must be *the foundation* of our faith and hope.

Obs. 14. This Kingdom in its relationship to "*the Man ordained,*" and through Him to the race, is not to be explained by a reference to one, two, or a few utterances, but by a comparison of many or all; and no explanation can be considered as valid if it is opposed by the expressed sense of the covenant or the general analogy of the Word. This especially is proper in view of the two natures of Christ conjoining in a special favored Theocratic reign in the Person of Jesus. Thus e.g. because "all power in heaven and earth" is given to Jesus, inferences of immediate and unbounded exertion of such power in the form of a Kingdom and covenanted Rulership are

found without number in works of theology and religion, but always, more or less, at the loss of definiteness and continued enthronement of the *Man Jesus and His Headship* of the race as David's Son in the capacity of Ruler. It is easy to designate systems of Divinity, which, from one single passage, infer and teach that when a certain period arrives (comp. Prop. 159) Jesus the Christ will throw aside all His distinctive offices, and will never again, after that, *be recognized as David's Son,* but will ever reign by virtue only of His Divine nature with the Father. Now, all this is simply the reception of a wrong inference from one or two passages and the ignoring of a multitude of other passages *that plainly teach the contrary.*

Indeed, as already stated, eminent men (as Neander, etc.) even go to such a length as to tell us that after the resurrection all human relations were cast aside and that He now is only to be recognized as the Son of God. A serious defect in many writers is this making all Scripture bend to inferences drawn from one or two passages, and overlooking the *ever continued covenanted* Personage of the Christ, the covenanted everlasting rule, the predictions based on the covenanted Kingdom, the postponement of the covenanted Kingdom to the Sec. Advent, etc., thus involving themselves in palpable contradictions and making a resort to spiritualizing a necessity, as well as the introduction of several kingdoms a refuge to cover deficiencies.

Obs. 15. Therefore, to preserve the due relationship that the human nature of Jesus sustains even in its exaltation and glorification to the Kingdom and to the race, *we must never swerve from the covenants.* God will, most assuredly, fulfil these covenants ; in them is delineated the position of David's Son and not that of another man or of Deity (i.e. considered independent of the human nature assumed) ; now any theory, inference, or doctrine which militates against the covenants is *not only open to grave suspicion, but must be rejected,* no matter by whom presented or however eloquently urged. God cannot, does not, contradict Himself. In this discussion the covenant is the measure of accuracy, being *the most solemnly given and strongly affirmed* portion of God's Holy Word. We need not repeat that the grammatical sense is alone allowable (comp. Prop. 49).

Obs. 16. A most fruitful source of misinterpreting this Kingdom, and, as a result, the Person and Relationship of the King, arises from not discriminating *to whom* this Kingdom is promised (comp. Prop. 81, etc.). The great defect, having a highly injurious influence, is this : the Davidic covenant, *although an everlasting covenant and solemnly affirmed by oath,* is totally suppressed or laid aside by theologians as something with which we have nothing to do, or, if referred to, is dismissed in a sentence or two either as typical or something to be spiritualized ; Jesus, consequently, is constantly spoken of as the Son of God, and His reign is based exclusively on His Divinity. Entire systems of Divinity, given by learned men, *make no mention whatever of the Davidic covenant,* and, as a consequence, exclude the humanity of Jesus from any participation in this reign with *the prominency* given to it in Scripture ; the humanity, somehow, simply by virtue of its having been related to the divine, becomes some vague, indefinite appendage, without bearing *its noble covenanted distinctive relationship* in manifested Rulership. Now this is the Origenistic, Augustinian, Popish derived view, unfortunately held and indorsed by many Protestants.

Holy Writ carefully specifies and guards the humanity of Jesus (1) in the covenant, (2) in the prophecies, (3) in preserved genealogical tables, (4) in the preaching of Jesus

and the Apostles, (5) in recognized descent and title in the last Revelation, (6) in ascribing, in direct terms, the future Kingdom to Him as "the Son of Man," (7) and in declaring the perpetuity of the Kingdom given to Him as "the Man ordained." Now a rejection of the systematic and logical statements of the Word forming a regular, unbroken series, is the source *of much error*—error, too, in a learned and attractive form. So much is this the case, that it is utterly impossible to stem it, being fortified by hosts of able and learned names, whose authority alone sways the multitude. It is only the deeply reflective, who receive the Word *as spoken*, and recognize the predicted fact that there will be but little faith in Christ's Coming as "the Son of Man" to sit on the throne of His glory, that ponder and accept these things. The author anticipates *unmeasured abuse* from some quarters for stating his views so plainly, and insisting so strongly upon the future reign of Jesus as "the Son of Man," just as covenanted. But he anticipates it only from those whose reverence for the Word is outweighed by human authority, prejudice, and bigotry; men of candor, judgment and high honor, however unable to accept of these views, yet seeing how they at least have a basis in the grammatical sense of covenant, prophecy, etc., will treat them with respect, lest unhappily they should be eventually found to have derided God's own ordering.

Obs. 17. It is sad to reflect that so many of God's ancient elect people, the Jews, should so far depart from *the covenants expressly given to them*—should so far reject faith *in the Son of David*, who is ultimately to reign according to the oath of the Almighty, that they put their trust *in man* himself. Alas! what a difference exists between the covenanted "*Sure mercies of David*," as presented in the Word, and that belief e.g. of Mr. Ellinger (editor of the *Jewish Times*), who said (quoted *Luth. Observer*, Oct. 31st, 1873) at the meeting of Free Religionists, held at New York in opposition to that of the Evang-Alliance of 1873, "*that humanity was the Messiah of the Jews.*"

Ellinger's statement is too sweeping, for he only speaks in behalf of the Rationalistic portion of the Jews who have adopted the Humanitarian views, while the orthodox Jews still persist in believing that the covenant will be realized according to God's oath. Comp. Prop. 193.

PROPOSITION 205. *The doctrine of the Kingdom materially aids us in preaching "the Christ"— the distinctive "Messiah."*

That "Christ" and "Messiah" are titular ascriptions, and not merely doctrinal words, has been already presented under Props. 153, Obs. 2 and 70, Obs. 11, and especially 199, Obs. 2. Many writers, some not in sympathy with us, fully indorse its Theocratic, Kingly title. The importance of this is so fully sustained by our entire argument, that a mere reference to some things pertaining to it is all that is necessary for a fitting conclusion, indicating how, by reason of a clearer conception of its meaning and design, it aids us in preaching "*the Christ.*"

Leathes ("The Religion of Christ," *Bampton Lectures* for 1874, Pref.) remarks: "The belief in Jesus as *the Christ* is not only common to every document comprised in it (New Test.), but is alike the very backbone and essential framework of all the documents." "We may take it, therefore, as a position which is unassailable, that the distinguishing mark of Christianity, from the very first, trace it back as far as we can, was the belief that Jesus was *the Christ.* So manifestly true is this statement that the mere expression of it has all the appearance of a truism." Such statements can be multiplied from other writers, but are unnecessary. Is this so? then how essential it is to have a proper conception of the Christ—the real meaning to be attached to the title—and the official position that it contemplates. Alas! with but comparatively few exceptions the modern Christ is not the Christ of the primitive Church, for the meaning has been changed and another substituted. He adds: "Taking the very widest possible margin, we may say within the first century and a half of our era this simple formula, *Jesus is the Christ,* had called into existence the whole of that literature, whatever its value, which is comprised in the New Testament." That Jesus was the Christ he pronounces "the underlying principle," "the root-principle," etc., and declares that if this is eliminated "you destroy the peculiar and essential features of their existence."

Obs. 1. Let the reader go back to the places referred to and ascertain the meaning of "Messiah" and "Christ," viz., that, as able men on all sides admit, they are equivalent to kingship, or highly expressive of Theocratic relationship (for the Theocratic Kings were "the Lord's Anointed"), and that, in view of the covenanted Theocratic ordering pertaining to Jesus, He pre-eminently bears the title of "*the Anointed,*" i.e. *the Theocratic King.* Keeping in view the plain meaning (as held by the Jews, the disciples, the early Church, etc.), and then noticing what our argument prominently brings forth, viz., the non-realization of the Theocratic order at the First Advent and the postponement of the same to the Sec. Advent, it becomes apparent that the title will only become practically realized when, in "*the day of the Lord Jesus the Christ,*" this Christ manifests the title in *the actual* Theocratic position occupied. When the Theocracy is re-established in power and glory, *then* the Messiah, the Christ, shines forth as the Anointed, the King in Israel, having obtained His appointed inheritance.

Covenant, prophecy, promise, the faith of pious Jews and of the early Church, the Theocratic ordering, the time of its re-establishment, the present design of this dispen-

sation, and, in brief, nearly all of our previous Propositions bring in an overwhelming converging testimony, showing that while Jesus is now "*the Christ*" and declared to be such by His life, teaching, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension, Headship over the Church, He is *not yet manifested as "the Christ"* in the actual possession of the Theocratic position indicated by the title. This is so evident, that the lack of faith in this title as expressed, and the substitution of a meaning not intended, is *a wide departure* from the truth, and must very seriously affect our interpretation of Scripture, giving it a coloring that overshadows a proper understanding of fundamental doctrines. Such a removal from the primitive faith is painfully manifest in even our leading works on "Christology," for, however valuable in many respects, they utterly fail to bring forth *the distinctive Christ* and point out His relationship to *the covenanted Theocracy*, and this mars the proper reception of much Scripture. Surely, he who professes to receive "the Christ" ought to be willing to bow to the scriptural meaning of the title. To confess "the Christ" as the primitive Christians did demands at the present day moral courage, seeing that the vast multitude spiritualize its meaning away. To confess "the Christ," as it once was done, will inevitably bring reproach from those even who honestly profess to love Him. This is one of the sad features connected with our present lot. This lack of faith, this turning away from so fundamental a view, only confirms our belief in it, seeing that such a state is predicted. We look for the time when this title will be better appreciated—when it will be publicly assumed by Him whose right it is, and then men will vehemently and bitterly oppose it until stricken by the wrath of "the Christ."

Obs. 2. On the other hand, under the influence of a supposed present existing Messianic Kingdom, men, mistaking the Divine Sovereignty for this specific Theocratic ordering and rule, have admitted the titular aspect, but (as e.g. *Ency. Relig. Knowledge*, etc.) give it a doctrinal cast as being at present fulfilled in His mediatorial office, thus being the equivalent of "Saviour." Christ is truly the Saviour, but it is in virtue of His Christship that He perfects Salvation; the Christship appertains to Him as a Person in a specified position. Rejecting the covenanted Kingdom, and receiving a purely Spiritual one, the title itself is correspondingly spiritualized and its ancient meaning discarded.[1] Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 325) sounds the keynote of this perversion, when informing us that "Messiah grammatically signifies King," but that it becomes "*a doctrinal word*" also equivalent to "Saviour" or "Redeemer." He painfully labors by a one-sided reasoning, by statements that we have already abundantly shown are not sustained, to set aside the Jewish covenanted idea of the Messiahship, viz., that "the Christ" is the One Person, a descendant of David, who is to reign on the restored Theocratic-Davidic Throne.[2]

[1] The spiritualistic conceptions are numerous, such as "the representative man," "the good," "the leader of humanity," "the ideal," etc. One of the most singular, totally ignoring covenant, etc., is that of the Shakers (Appletons' *Cyclop.*) as given by Elder Evans: "Christ is applied by them as a generic term to the highest or innermost sphere, exterior to the deific sphere called in the Scriptures eternity." The most absurd view is that of Taylor in *Syntagma*, viz., that Jesus never existed, but that the early Christians meant the words 'Jesus Christ' to be only a personification of reason, goodness, love, etc. Some make "progress" the Christ; others "humanity realized." Some make their own system the Christ, as e.g. Choate (*Religio-Philosophical Journal*, April 3, 1875) says: "To me Spiritualism is the new Christ, arrayed in the purple splendor of the present, and haloed with the divine possibilities of the future." Scholasticism, Mysticism, Fanaticism, etc., have greatly hindered the proper historical and scriptural idea of "the Christship"—the perversion of which reached its extreme in David Jorris "the Christ-David" or "the true Christ after the Spirit," in Ann Lee, "the Female Christ," and in other fanatics claiming the glorious title.

[2] He is also contradictory, as e.g. he charges (p. 319) the Jews with exclusiveness, as if the Messiah only pertained to their own nation and all others were excluded from the blessings of His reign, and yet (p. 323) he informs us that the Jews held that while "King of the Jews," He would also be "a universal monarch, who would reign over all

nations. Thus they interpreted the passages, Ps. 2 : 2, 6, 8 ; Jer. 23 : 5, 6 ; Zech. 9 : 4 seq." What is true of Dr. Knapp applies to many eminent divines, who acknowledging the import of the title then afterward engraft upon it *a doctrinal* signification to suit their respective theories of the Kingdom.

Obs. 3. The testimony of divines, however, making these words a distinctive title is ample. In addition to those already given, this interesting and vital point can well receive others. Van Oosterzee (*Ch. Dog.*, vol. 2, p. 527) forcibly says : "It (i.e. Messiah or Christ) is equivalent to saying that He is *the King of Israel*, promised in old times by the prophets, sent into the world by the Father, anointed with the Holy Ghost, and destined to rule forever over a Kingdom which is ever enduring." "His *Theocratic dignity* is designated." Farrar (*Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 26) justly observes that the English version improperly uses "Christ" as a proper name instead of an appellative, a distinction observed by Lactantius, *Div. Insti.*, 4 : 7, etc. Pearson (*On the Creed*, p. 107 seq.) speaks of Jesus, "who is also called Christ, not by name, but *by office and title*," and quotes Tertullian, S. Hieron., Lactant., Isidor, and Cyril as defining it thus, a name importing office, dignity. He correctly makes the name of Jesus equivalent to Saviour, but Christ the title of honor, royal station.[1] Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 378) says that the title "Christ"—"in its common use it properly signifies King," and then proceeds to show how, by the ecclesiastical Fathers (Ambrosius, Ruffinus, Clement of Alex., and others), it was extended to embrace other meanings to apply it to the mediatorial work of Christ, and then, in an alleged "critical judgment," positively asserts : "According to the true use of the Word in the Bible Messiah signifies only King. Many were anointed, but kings were called, by way of eminence, *the anointed.*" Pressense (*The Early Days of Christianity*) gives the utterance of many able writers, when he justly pronounces "Christ" to be a "*Theocratic Title.*" Oehler (Art. "Messiah" in Herzog's *Ency.*) says : "But pre-eminently is 'the Anointed,' Jehovah's name of honor, that of *Theocratic King.*"[2]

[1] Ernesti and many others have insisted that the Scriptures by the title of Christ indicated the kingly office, and this, in view of the Jewish belief, led Eckermann and others (Knapp's *Ch. Theol.*, pp. 325, 322) to "declare that the doctrine that Jesus is the Messiah belongs only to the Jews and is not *an essential* doctrine of pure Christianity." Such a declaration is an utter ignoring of the covenants and predictions pertaining to Christ, and the specific position and work assigned to Him, as "the Christ," in the future. It is incorporated by the Apostles as essential to the Coming Kingdom, and faith in "the Christ" inspires hope of glorious deliverance under His reign. Knapp is not candid in his strictures on Eckermann, for when the latter asserts "that the Old Test. descriptions of the Messiah are not descriptions of *Jesus*, but of an *earthly* king," the former leaves the covenant and predictions which unite the earthly with the Theocratic ordering for purposes of salvation, and speaks only of the spiritual aspects pertaining to salvation. The true scriptural answer to Eckermann and others is this : the earthly relationship is *essential* to the Theocratic order, and if it were lacking *no restored Theocracy* could ever be reared resulting in perfected redemption. The spiritual and the earthly, the divine and human, the heavenly and the worldly, are united under the Messianic sway. (Comp. Prop. 197.)

[2] A multitude of similar testimony might be adduced, but is not requisite in view of the facts following. The application of the title (Anointed One) to the priesthood is forbidden by the simple fact that this is spoken of, and relates to, not a descendant of Aaron, but a Son of David, and hence necessarily points, *as covenanted, to his regality.* In the art. "Jesus Christ" in McClintock and Strong's *Cyclop.*, it is properly said : "This double designation is not, like Simon Peter, John Mark, Joses Barnabas, composed of a name and a surname, but, like John the Baptist, Simon Magus, Bar-Jesus

Elymus, of a proper name *and an official title.*" It makes "Christ" to mean "Anointed," "the official title of our Saviour," so that "Christ is not, strictly speaking, a proper name, but a designation of office;" but, after all, sight is lost of those definitions, and the official title is changed into a doctrinal word! We protest against this unauthorized change as not only misleading, but placing a barrier to the proper comprehension of the future greatness and glory of Jesus.

Obs. 4. The title of Messiah or Christ was based by the Jews on the covenanted and predicted King who should descend from David, and rule as the Theocratic King on David's throne.[1] The blessed times resulting from His reign were designated "the times of the Messiah." The Samaritans (who separated from the Jews before the Babylonian exile) also believed (John 4 : 25, 29, 42) in "the Christ." It was founded upon Divine Revelation, and consequently the Apostles, and even Jesus Himself, appeal to the Scriptures as containing the Messianic idea, and use the title without the least attempt to explain its long-adopted meaning. It was this belief in *the Theocratic sense* that urged the Jews to the desire to proclaim Him King (John 6 : 15, etc.); that gave Herod (Matt. 2 : 4) his uneasiness, and suggested his bloody persecution; that influenced His accusers before Pilate (Luke 22 : 2) to call Him "the Christ, a King," pleading (John 19 : 12), when Pilate "sought to release Him," "If thou let this Man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend; whosoever maketh himself *a King* speaketh against Cæsar." The condemnation of Jesus was based on His Christship, understood as the assumption of a Kingship. Before Caiphas He was adjured whether He was "the Christ" (Math. 26 : 63), and the reply, referring to Dan. 7, indicates (1) that He claimed the title; (2) that He was understood as thus claiming it (comp. Mark 14 : 61, where the Evangelist says He replied "I am," etc., and Luke 22 : 67–71); and (3) that the charge of "blasphemy," "guilty of death," was founded on the claim, causing them afterward, in mockery, to say (showing their views), "Prophesy unto us, *thou Christ*" (Matt. 26 : 68). In the Person of Jesus there was a plain, decided rejection of "the Christ," seeing that this was the matter discussed. Now, if Jesus, as moderns inform us, only meant under this title "a doctrinal word," how could He, if an honest Person, allow the Jews to remain under a prejudice as to the name which was positively suggested by the grammatical sense of the Word? No! the Jews were correct in their idea that the name was expressive of a real, literal Theocratic Kingship.[2] Before Pilate this Christship was made synonymous with "the King of the Jews" (as covenanted), and Pilate understood that "Jesus, which is called Christ," must, by the very assumption of the title, claim to be King, and therefore the pertinent question: "*Art thou the King of the Jews?*" At the last moment Pilate asks (John 19 : 15), "*Shall I crucify your King?*" and "the chief priests answered, We have no King but Cæsar." "The Christ" of Matthew is made by Mark (15 : 9, 12) equivalent to "*the King of the Jews,*" and the superscription of the cross, the mocking, the crowning, the arraying with a robe, the derision of the soldiers, "the accusation" (Matt. 27 : 36, 37)—all is based on the assumed Christship of Jesus. Even when suspended upon the cross, His Messiahship was derided by the chief priests, etc., (Matt. 27 : 42) as "*the King of Israel*" and (Mark 15 : 32) as the "*Christ, the King of Israel.*" Let the student *ponder this meaning* so persistently and variously presented, and consider how utterly impossible it would be after this to

make it "a doctrinal word" without the most express affirmation that the original meaning has been authoritatively changed.[3]

[1] The Talmudists declared that "the name of Messias" was one of the things constituted before the world (Barrow's *Works*, vol. 2, p. 345). "The Rabbins and Cabalists" (working on the etymology of the word, see Knapp's *Theol.*, p. 378) ascribe to the Messiah a threefold dignity (crown), viz., the crown of the law, of the priesthood, and of the Kingdom. Vide Schoettgen, in his work on the Messiah, s. 107, 298. The customary and pre-eminent meaning attached by the Jews to it was that of King in the line enforced by our argument. In *Nathaniel* (1868–69, vol. 12, p. 49, etc.) the editor refers to the ancient prayers of the Hebrews, still retained in prayer-books, in which the Coming of the Messiah is prayed for, and He is called "the Anointed One," "the Branch of David," "the Son of thy servant David," "the King," "the Son of Jesse, the Bethlehemite," "our Anointed One," "Thy Anointed One," "Thy Anointed One of the house of David."

[2] "Was Pilate right in crucifying Jesus?" has been answered affirmatively by Stephen in *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, and negatively by Innes in an art. on *The Trial of Jesus Christ*. (Judge Jones, *Notes on New Test.*, an eminent jurist, aptly shows the injustice of His condemnation. Innes (*Contemp. Review*, 1877), on "The Trial of Jesus Christ," correctly represents how the claim of the Christship was understood by both the Jews and the Romans, viz., as "*a royal* Messiah, i.e. *a King*," which constituted the crime "*Majestas*—the greatest crime known in Roman law, the greatest crime conceivable by the Roman imagination, an attack upon the sovereignty or supreme majesty of the Roman state," "adequately expressed by one word, 'treason.'" This accounts for two things, worthy of the critical student's notice: (1) the reason why Pilate, after being convinced that the State had nothing to fear from this single unarmed person whose death was demanded by his own people, still allowed his death to ensue, lest the threat of the Jews to report him as no friend of Cæsar's might involve him in grave difficulties with the supreme power of the State; and (2) that this explains why the severity of providential punishment fell, not on the Romans who were made the triumphant instruments of inflicting it, but, on the Jewish nation. The Jews had a correct Messianic conception and knew what it implied, and hence were guilty of the crime of employing it—when designed specially to bless them, etc.—in order to procure the death of Jesus. The Romans were ignorant of its Theocratic meaning, its covenanted and divine right, etc., and therefore did not sustain the same relationship to Him in condemnation and death. This is the reason why the Scriptures single out the Jewish nation as the guilty party in the awful tragedy.

[3] The announcing angel to Mary (Luke 1 : 31–33) gives the personal name of Jesus and then without expressing the title Christ describes the Christship in v. 32 and 33. So the angels tell the shepherds (Luke 2 : 11) of "a Saviour, which is *Christ, the Lord*," and Simeon (v. 26) being permitted to see "*the Lord's Christ*," implies in the very phraseology the Theocratic Kingship. The devils (Luke 4 : 41) knew Him as "the Christ," and as we have shown (Prop. 106) the temptation of Satan was addressed to "the Christship" of Jesus. The Kingship of Jesus attributed by the Jews, Acts 17 : 7, implies "the Christship." (Comp. Matt. 2 : 4–6; Mark 15 : 32, etc., and see Jewish testimony in "Psalterium Salamonis," Prop. 73, Obs. 5, note, and in coms. generally.) That the assumption of the title "Messiah" was understood by the Jews to be treasonable to the State, is likewise apparent in the history of false Messiahs, as e.g. in the case of Sabatai Sevi, of whom the Turkish Government was informed by a disappointed follower, Nehemiah Cohen, of the dangerous meaning couched under the title, viz., the overthrow of Gentile rule and restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom. All writers admit that with the Jew the title was the equivalent of king in and over the Theocratic Kingdom, seeing that kings were called such (e.g. Saul, 1 Sam. 24 : 6, "The Lord's Anointed," David, 2 Sam. 23 : 1, and Zedekiah, Lam. 4 : 20, "The Anointed of the Lord"), and the Messianic predictions (as e.g. Ps. 2 : 2, and 22 : 6, etc.), designated the one to come as Ruler, "The Anointed." So Dan. 9 : 25 gives us "Messiah the Prince," in which the latter word may be explanatory of the former, or else we may receive Fausset's (*Com. loci*) explanation: "Messiah is Jesus's title in respect to Israel (Ps. 2 : 2; Matt. 27 : 37, 42). Nagid (the Prince), as Prince of the Gentiles (Isa. 55 : 4)." A comparison of Acts 8 : 5 with v. 12 shows the relationship to the Kingdom, which Philip preached. John shows the distinction and importance of the Christship, e.g. John 20 : 31; 1 John 5 : 1, etc. Even Ps. 45 : 8 usually applied to the priesthood and prophetical office, but the being anointed with "the oil of gladness above His fellows," has, as the context shows, a de-

cided reference to His Kingship, seeing that in the first verse it is positively stated that the psalm contains the "good matter: I speak of the things which I have made *touching the King*," and hence, as His "fellows," the co-heirs, also possess Theocratic rulership, the superiority of this King above all others is asserted. The student will even find something in Hannah's exultant prophetic song (1 Sam. 2 : 1–10). Fairbairn (*Typology*, p. 91, note) says that the clause "exalt the horn of His anointed" (connected with the overthrow of enemies and judging) "might as well, and indeed better, have been rendered, 'Exalt the horn of His Messiah;'" and refers to Kimchi as applying it to the Messiah, and the Targum paraphrasing it, "He shall multiply the Kingdom of the Messiah." He then remarks: "It is the first passage of Scripture where the word occurs in its more distinctive sense, and is used as a synonym of the consecrated or divine king." (This Messiah in virtue of His relationship to David and the meaning of David (Beloved) is called "David," Isa. 55 : 3, 4; Hos. 3 : 5; Jer. 30 : 9; Ezek. 34 : 23, 24, and 37 : 24, 25.)

Frothingham, in *The Cradle of the Christ*, repeats what hundreds previously have asserted, viz., that the records indisputably teach that Jesus believed Himself to be "the Messias," i.e. the King expected by the Jews. But this is precisely what the Records, if Jesus is the covenanted Son of David, ought to teach, and the student is reminded that we have proven (as e.g. under Props. 70–76, etc.) that after the death of Jesus the Messianic idea remained unchanged, until the influence of the Alexandrian school perverted it, and this perversion became general and imbedded in theology. Frothingham teaches in his work that Paul was at first a Messianic believer as the Jews held, but suddenly (in view of his Greek associations) another idea of the Messiah revealed itself to him—a kind of spiritualizing of the former notion—and Paul, adopting and teaching this spiritualized conception, commenced the origin of Christianity. He designates this Paul's "new departure." This re-statement of an old objection is flatly contradicted by the postponement of the Kingdom (and hence also the manifestation of the Messiahship) until the Second Advent by Jesus and in which postponement and manifestation Paul entirely concurred, as is proven by the Scriptures (comp. Props. 58–68, and 70–76) and by the history of the early Church (Props. 75–78) showing that the Jewish idea of the Messiah was retained, east and west, by all the churches established by Paul and the other disciples. Such argumentation can only arise from an ignoring of the simple facts as given in the New Test., of the faith of Paul and the early Church. The alleged change in meaning, so frequently urged by unbelievers, is historically a much later one, and was introduced by uninspired men spiritualizing the Record.

Obs. 5. We have already shown that the immediate disciples and apostles held to this Messianic idea (i.e. Kingship over the restored Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom), as indicated by their preaching, etc. This is so incontrovertible that even Knapp (*Ch. Theol.*, p. 323) concedes it, for after giving the Jewish idea of Messiah or Christ, he adds: "The apostles themselves held this opinion until after the resurrection of Christ," Matt. 20 : 20, 21; Luke 24 : 21; Acts 1 : 6. The question arises, Were they mistaken in this idea? The majority of modern divines insist that they were mislead, over against the opinion of the early Church and others that they were not mistaken. If the former opinion is correct, then it involves the honesty and integrity of Jesus, viz., that He could deliberately allow—if the word Christ means no more than moderns assert—the disciples to be in ignorance on so important a point, being the heart of the Kingdom preached. Leaving past Propositions to sustain the belief of the disciples and apostles (thus vindicating their faith and preaching and the honor of Jesus), attention is directed to one passage, which ought to be decisive. In Matt. 16 : 16, Mark 8 : 29, and Luke 9 : 20, Peter, in answer to the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" answers: "*Thou art the Christ.*" Jesus replied that he was "blessed" because the Father had revealed this fact to him. Now, how could he be "blessed," how could the matter be revealed to him, if he did not understand the meaning of "Christ?" That he

comprehended it in the Jewish Theocratic sense is *self-evident* from e.g. Acts 1 : 6.

My friend, Rev. Dr. Sprecher, in a conversation on this point, stated that it is abundantly evident that when Jesus was born it was believed that He was "the Christ," the born "King of the Jews," and that in view of this His enemies took measures, based on this claim, to put him to death. And what is remarkable, thus agreeing with covenant and prophecy, not the slightest hint is given that His disciples or enemies were mistaken, but the contrary is implied and asserted. All could say (John 1 : 41, and 4 : 25) : "*We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.*" To this we add, as has already been proven, that the Person of this Christ has the divine and human united—for the Kingship of David's Son and of David's Lord are united, constituting the one King, the one Christ. This is a sufficient refutation of the reasoning of Reber (*The Christ of Paul*), that in the Gospel of John there is "a labored effort to sink the humanity of Christ," and that the Gospel was written by Irenæus (a Millenarian). (Comp. remarks of Oosterzee, *Theol. New Test.*, p. 301, etc., on Paul's laying so much stress on the humanity of Jesus.) For, it will be seen by a comparison, that every writer thus observed the Person of "the Christ," one regarding Him more from the covenanted human standpoint, the other from the Theocratic ordering, but both recognizing the union of the two in Him. Again : Spinoza and others have objected to the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew Scriptures, and many in reply have explained it as only such in language, an accommodation to human imperfection. May we suggest that the Theocratic conception, "The Christ," may serve to explain the matter—viz., may not the Plan of Redemption contemplating a Theocratic rule in a Person in whom God is united with man thus foreshadow the coming incorporated adaptation?

Obs. 6. The student will also observe how often (as in connection with Peter's confession, etc.) the disciples were charged *not to make Him known* as "the Christ." If "Christ" is merely "a doctrinal word," no satisfactory reason can be given for this prohibition. Take the Theocratic sense and consider that the Kingdom was tendered conditionally on repentance, that the nation refused repentance, that the representative men of the nation conspired to put Jesus to death, that it had already been determined to postpone the Kingdom to a Second Coming, and the prohibition—in view also of the use made of the Christship to the Roman power—is in accord with discretion and wisdom. Having gone over this before, it is sufficient to add that this prohibition extended only to the death of Jesus, because afterward it became the favorite title, seeing (1) that in view of His death it became essential to show that He was still "the Christ;" (2) that notwithstanding His death, faith in "the Christ" evinced hope in the ultimate fulfilment of covenant and prophecy pertaining to it ; and (3) the death of Jesus would, owing to unbelief, enable the Christship to be proclaimed without the fear of being regarded in rebellion against the Roman Empire, for what could earthly Kingdoms fear from a dead, crucified Christ?

This view, that we maintain, can alone satisfactorily explain the extraordinary omissions in the history of Jesus, His frequent withdrawals from the public to the private shade, the lack of those modernized ideas respecting "the Christ," and the persistent usage maintained throughout the entire Scriptures concerning it. If it were merely to denote the moral, religious, spiritual, ideal, etc., that so many attach to it, what reason, conclusive, can be possibly given to account for all this concealment of "the Christ"? Swedenborg claims that he was specially appointed to make known this Christ in His fulness, and asserts that he received his revelations from the Lord Himself. The man may be sincere in his imaginings, but that it is *pure delusion* is evident only from two considerations : (1) from his totally misapprehending "the Christ"—the meaning even of the word ; and (2) from his pointedly misconceiving the Kingdom, and flatly contradicting covenant and promise in reference to it. In the *Apoc. Revealed*, vol. 1, s. 520, he

makes "the Christ" to mean "divine humanity" and "the reason why the Lord's divine humanity is meant by Christ, is, because Christ is the Messiah, and the Messiah is the Son of God, who was expected to come into the world." Let the student observe its irrelevancy: (1) because the Messiah (Christ) is the Messiah, it denotes the divine humanity; (2) because the Messiah is the Son of God, it means the same. Now "the Christ" includes in His Person and Sonship a divine humanity (i.e. the human united with the divine, etc), but this, as we have abundantly shown, only qualifies Him for the position of "the Christ," i.e. Theocratic Kingship. The *Person* eminently fitted for the office is not to be confounded with *the office itself*. Hence Leathes (*The Religion of Christ*, p. 3): "The name of Christ, however, suggests an office rather than a person. It implies the supposed fulfilment of various preconceived ideas." While Leathes in his work falls into the common mistake of making the Christship too much the equivalent of Redeemer (i.e. doctrinal), he is correct in the sentence quoted, although now since the assurances given by Jesus and His acknowledgment by the Father this title belongs to Him, and the Person and title suggest each other and cannot be disconnected.

Obs. 7. It is taken for granted by multitudes, without a particle of proof, that the Jewish meaning of "Christ" was (as Knapp and others, see note to Obs. 4, for example) changed after the death of Jesus. In past Propositions it has been proven that this is *a misapprehension of fact*, as is evidenced e.g. in all the churches established by the apostles, east and west, retaining the Jewish idea of the Messiah, viz., as the Anointed One who should come again to re-establish in power and glory the Theocratic-Davidic Kingdom. Let the student ponder this simple fact, and how can he account for it unless he concedes—as covenant and prophecy demand—*the retention* of the Theocratic idea in the title "Messiah" or "Christ." Let him also reflect what the general view was down to the ascension of Christ, and if a change in *so vital* a matter—relating to the sense and faithfulness of Scripture, the nature and establishment of the Kingdom, the highest interests of man and the world—was really made, we ought to find it specifically mentioned. *But where is such a change intimated?* It is pure human inference, founded on a misconception of the covenanted Kingdom. No such advocated change could possibly take place without a rejection of the Davidic covenant; without informing the Jews that they were mistaken in their conceptions of the Messiah and induce them to receive Jesus as "the Christ" on other grounds; without a sufficient and satisfactory explanation why the Messianic idea, entertained for ages, should prove a failure or be transmuted into something else. Can we explain the sudden conversion of so many Jews who, above all things, tenaciously (urged both by covenant and prophecy) held to the Messianic notion as presented by us, unless it be shown that the reception of Jesus also embraced the retention of the most cherished idea of "the Christ." This retention is self-evident. Take e.g. the simple and often-repeated statement (proven again and again in our argument as under Props. 44, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, etc., also 111, 121, 122, etc.) that the apostles, after the ascension of Jesus, instead of changing the Messianic idea, constantly pointed all believers to the Sec. Advent for *a glorious realization* of the promises connected with the Christship of Jesus.

Paul, in view of the manner of his conversion, was satisfied that the crucified Jesus was indeed the Christ, and hence at once (Acts 9 : 20, 22) "he preached Christ in the synagogues," "proving that this (Jesus) is *the very Christ*. But how did he give this proof? Certainly not by changing the Messianic idea, but by representing that *this Crucified One* (which was the stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the Grecians, 1 Cor. 1 : 23) should, as his reiterated statements in his epistles show, *come again* and manifest Himself *as the Christ*. The critical student will find that according to the

testimony of Church historians (e.g. Hase's *His. Ch. Church*, ch. 2, Sec. 45) the early retention of the Messianic idea of the title gave place finally among the Gentiles—not conversant with its covenanted relationship—to a loss of its special significance ; the Christ being " simply the Lord and the Son of God." The truth is that as century followed century, and the Davidic covenant was more and more set aside, the departure from the primitive idea became so fixed that no reference to the covenant, upon which the Messianic title is unmistakably founded, was deemed necessary. The Theocracy itself was converted into the Church, and the Messiahship was supposed to be fully manifested through it. Potter (*Freedom and Fellowship*), in the essay on " Christianity and its Definitions," points out that historical and doctrinal Christianity is based on the confession that Jesus is " the Christ" or " the expected Messiah of Jewish vision and prophecy," and that a belief in the Christship was made obligatory upon the primitive Ch. Church. He then truthfully asserts that " in the course of eighteen centuries it has come to pass that this confession, though continued accurately in terms, *means practically something very different* from what it did to those primitive followers of Jesus." Alas ! this is *only too true.* Many of the declarations of modern Christianity on this point would not be recognized by the early Church. Take able writers, and this departure from primitive belief is painfully evident. Thus e.g. Gregory (*Four Gospels*, p. 129) makes Jesus acting as the Messiah of " a world-wide spiritual society, an everlasting state, the Kingdom of heaven," and then following Principal Tulloch in his lectures on Renan, he says : " For whatever Jesus may have been besides, He was also primarily the Messiah, the highest development of Judaism —humanly speaking, *the ideal* Jew," etc. The Messiahship is frittered away into being " the highest expression of all that is good in Judaism—the inheritor of whatever moral wisdom, whatever spiritual genius, survived it." *Where then,* we ask, are God's oath-bound covenant and promises ? Are these *also ideal,* and did God, for many centuries, leave His people under the gross impression of *their reality ?* While not rejecting the Supernatural ideal (Gill, *Christian Conception and Experience*), and all that can be said in praise of Jesus, this does not lead us to discard the fundamental and blessed meaning of the Messiahship. The prevailing view (as illustrated in Edwards's *His. Redemption*) and its application, are *totally unknown* to the Old and New Test. Some of the ablest defences of Christianity are vitiated by *an entire misapprehension* of " the Messiah." Thus, Walker's *Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation*, ch. 11, etc., prejudging the Messianic Kingdom and the faith of the Jews in prophecy through the influence of his entertained Church-Kingdom view, makes the title a doctrinal word, and rejects as Jewish error the idea of a restoration of a Davidic Kingdom and the constituting of Jesus an earthly Ruler. To make out his case he (1) ignores the Davidic covenant, or spiritualizes it ; (2) passes by the express prophecies which teach it, and which led the Jews to their belief ; (3) overlooks one class of predictions to lay stress on another, relating to humiliation and death, i.e. to those pertaining to the First Advent ; (4) refuses the teaching of the conditional offering of the Kingdom and its postponement ; (5) does not see how the Scriptures link the realization of that which he condemns, to the Sec. Advent ; (7) and throughout substitutes a spiritual sense for the plain grammatical one. Such a line of reasoning, which persistently rejects *fundamental ideas clearly taught,* is irrelevant. The fulfilling of one class of predictions at the First Advent is no proof that we are to ignore just as literal a fulfilment of another class at the Second Advent, but the reverse ; while the application of the latter class to the past and present (done only by a method of spiritualizing) is, to say the least, *a changing* of the Word.

Obs. 8. Our whole argument shows that when He comes again, *He comes as " the Christ,"* the Anointed King who is to reign as David's Son and Lord just as covenant and prophecy require. Jesus claims that when He comes again it is as " the Christ" (Mark 14 : 61, 62) ; " the day of the Lord Jesus Christ" is still future (Props. 138 and 139) ; the Judgment seat (or throne) of Christ (Rom. 14 : 10 and 2 : 16) will be established on earth (Props. 133 and 134), the saints at Christ's appearing shall appear with Him in glory (Col. 3 : 4), the saints when He comes to reign shall reign with Christ (Rev. 20 : 4), in brief, compare 2 Thess. 1 : 1, 2 ; Phil. 3 20 ; Rev. 11 : 15 ; 1 Thess. 5 : 9, 23 ; 1 Cor. 15 : 21–23 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 7, 8 ; Acts 17 : 30, 31 ; 1 Thess. 2 : 19 and 3 : 13 ; Tit. 2 : 12, 13 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 7, 13 ; 1 John 2 : 8, etc. If there is a truth clearly taught in the Scriptures,

it certainly is this one, that "the Christ" shall thus come and exhibit His mighty power and glory *as* "*Christ*" in delivering His people, punishing His enemies, and reigning gloriously as "the King of kings."

Let the attentive reader observe, that the Apostles lay great stress on the fact that "the Christ" died for us, gave Himself for our sins, in order that He might redeem us. This would be exceedingly forcible to the Jewish mind, or to any one who received the covenant and prophecies in their grammatical sense. Then "the Messiah" gave Himself for a sacrifice in our behalf; *the Anointed One, the King Himself dies* to save us; and this very feature of the case—enhancing the greatness of the offering, the submission and love of the Saviour—makes the title Christ *such a favorite* with the Apostles, pointing as it does to the past, the present benefits, and the future perfected redemption. If the reader will refer to Prop. 199, Obs. 7, note 1, he will find the defect pointed out in prevailing theology which gives us only a part of "the Christ." Some systems make the death of Christ the central idea; others give us the Incarnation as such, but while each of these are indispensable, neither of them are more *than provisional* in order that the covenant may ultimately be realized under "the Christ." It is the Theocratic King as manifested, and the glorious Kingdom that He institutes as "the Christ," that brings us blessed deliverance. The Kingdom is the end—the centre around which all revolves, while "the Christ" (not in one aspect, but in His perfected manifestation) is the heart of that centre. The King and the Kingdom cannot be separated; the one suggests the other, and the one belongs to the other in perpetual relationship. It is evident to any student of the Word that Dr. Gleig (*His. Bible*, vol. 2, p. 204) must have penned the following sentence through inadvertency: "Besides, it is an error to assert that the Messiah is *more frequently* or *more plainly* described as a triumphant Monarch than as a suffering man." The fact is that the two classes of prophecies bear no comparison to each other as seen in these pages, for the very title, official designation, itself suggests—even while suffering—the triumphant Monarch. The fact, too, that the early faith took its name "Christian," not from the proper name Jesus, but from His royal title, evidences how highly important and declarative (of coming Kingship) it appeared to those early believers. Its exceeding preciousness was a prominent feature in the Millenarian faith, for believing in "the Christ" and His future revelation as such, this confession of the Christship of Jesus by its assumption in name was *the foundation* of their joyful hopes of deliverance and completed salvation. Some prophetical writers, not observing the proper distinction, designate (so e.g. Wilson, *Proph. Times*, N. S., May, 1878, p. 102) the ministry of Jesus down to His crucifixion "The Ministry of Christ as the Messiah," and inform us that "His ministry as their Messiah was terminated by their final rejection of Him; and His crucifixion terminated their national covenant." Now the real facts are, as we have shown under various Propositions, that His ministry was only *preparatory* to the Messiahship (publicly manifested in possession of that which the title implies), seeing that the Christship with what it involves, was, owing to Jewish non-repentance and rejection, held *in abeyance and postponed*, and the assurance is given of the nation finally—after the times of the Gentiles are ended—beholding and accepting of *the same Messiah*. While the Jewish ritual was abolished by the sacrifice of Jesus, this cannot be extended, as we have shown in detail in other places, to a termination of "their national covenant." The interesting article of Wilson (same, June, 1878, p. 126), while applicable to a ceremonial, does not apply to an enduring, perpetual national rejection, for this would strike a deadly blow at oath-bound promises, Jewish election, our engrafting, Jewish restoration and supremacy, etc. This holding in abeyance of a manifested Messiahship—i.e. fulfilling what the title imports—until the Sec. Advent, must not be mistaken for rejection.

Obs. 9. The last opposition of the kings of the earth is against "*the Christ*," for they are "angry," Rev. 11 : 18, that He comes to assert His covenanted claims. He comes (e.g. Rev. 19) as the King (i.e. the Christ), and "the Kings of the earth and their armies are gathered together to make war against Him." In Acts 4 : 26 we find Ps. 2 : 1, 2 applied in an inchoate fulfilment to the opposition of Herod, etc., "*against His Christ*." In 1 John 2 : 22 the great antichristian spirit, which virtually denies by its works and opposition the Father and the Son, is designated:

"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus *is the Christ.*" As previously intimated, a comparison of Scripture indicates (Prop. 174, 180, etc.) that at the ending of this dispensation a knowledge of the Christship of Jesus and the claims of Kingship which it necessarily involves, will, more or less, be extended among the kings of the earth, and prove to be one, if not the chief, cause for the unrelenting hostility manifested against "the Christ." They will feel that if such claims are allowed, *then*, as predicted, their Gentile domination must inevitably cease (Prop. 164). But blinded by prejudice, ambition, the love of power, and unbelief, instead (Ps. 2 : 10–12) of being "wise," acknowledging "the Son," and tendering obedience, they resist "the Christ," and "perish" under "His wrath." It is *the distinctive* "Christ," coming to manifest Himself as such, that is opposed, and all opposition is effectually crushed under the mighty Theocratic King.

It is a sad fact that two parties will afford the reasoning by which the rulers of earthly governments and their subjects will be influenced, in sustaining their temporal power, etc., against the Theocratic claims of King Jesus, viz., unbelievers and believers. Unbelievers (as seen e.g. in *Ecce Homo*, Schenkel, Renan, Furness, and others) will claim that "the Christ" is simply the ideal or representative man, the hero and head of a religious revolution, etc., or that (as seen in the *Telegraph*, No. 37) "any just and perfect being is Christ," or that (as seen in the numerous extracts given by us) there never was such a historical Person, He being the creature of Jewish imagination and religious fanaticism, etc. All these, moderate and extremists, totally ignore or decry the specific Messianic claims as a mere remnant of Judaism. If we take the most liberal utterances of unbelief, most eulogistic and professedly founded on the Gospels, yet these claims are *contemptuously* set aside. Thus e.g. Potter (*Christianity and its Definitions*) says: "Christianity is the substance of what Jesus Himself taught—that is, God's love to man and man's love to God and to his fellow-men—and *does not consist in any doctrine about Jesus;* and the Christian is one who lives habitually in the same attitude toward God and man as did Jesus." This "definition" is to be called *evangelical* as well as *liberal*, since it professes to find its authority in the Gospels. This does not touch the historical rise of Christianity, and leaves untouched the fundamentals of Christianity, and the highest claims of Jesus to our faith and reverence. The distinctive Christ is entirely omitted, and an example for imitation (good as far as it goes) is alone presented. A solitary qualification is singled out and made to stand for the Messiah. (2) It is sad to find multitudes of believers who ignore and despise "the Christ" *as covenanted*, but it is more painful still to see the most eminent and valuable of writers swaying an influence in the same direction. We select an excellent author to illustrate: Rogers (*Superhuman Origin of the Bible*), in several of his highly interesting Apologetic lectures, totally misapprehends the Christship, and converts it into a doctrinal word. Speaking of the Jewish conception of the Messiah, he (e.g. p. 61) asks how the Jewish mind could receive Jesus as "the Christ" when His life, etc., was so contradictory to their views of "a triumphant Messiah, who, while swaying his sceptre over the subject nations, should confirm and enhance the privileges of the favored people, and reflect upon them the lustre of his reign," etc. This he calls the Jewish "day dream for centuries," and pronounces an "illusion." He thus denies *the covenanted meaning of "the Christ,"* and teaches, by implication, that such a claim as the word indicates and was believed in should be resisted as a mere "day dream" and "illusion." He overlooks *why* the Jewish mind and heart, still retaining its "day dream," could receive the crucified Jesus as "the Christ," viz. that His life, death, resurrection and exaltation *confirmed Him as "the Messiah,"* who had *postponed* the fulfilment of the covenanted promises to the Sec. Advent. Alas! Rogers is courteous in his rejection of the pure Messianic idea, in comparison with many, many others, who treat the Theocratic order involved in it as "the grossest fanaticism," and the most childish and foolish of conceptions. These are paving the way.

Obs. 10. This subject of the Christship is exceedingly important, for without it we could have no hope of the fulfilment of covenant and prophecy—of the Coming Kingdom and glory. Oosterzee, Kahnis, and

others have well answered the question, What value must we Gentile Christians attach to the truth and confession of the Messiahship of Jesus? But in addition we add that our entire line of argument makes this *distinctively fundamental*, seeing that all our hopes of ultimate salvation, the restitution of all things, the blessedness and exceeding glory of the future Kingdom, depends upon the Christship of Jesus. It is as the Messiah that He comes to be the Saviour of the world, and, therefore, a proper conception of "the Christ," is *a vital one* to a proper understanding of perfected Redemption. What "the Christ" has done in the past and present is only an earnest of what He will do for us when He is revealed as "the Christ" in Christly honor, regality, power, and glory.

Barrow (*Works*, vol. 2, p. 346) has well observed: "That Jesus is *the Christ*, is the principal article of pure faith; the most peculiar doctrine of our religion as such, and as distinct from all other religions; it indeed virtually comprehends all other doctrines of moment therein, regarding either faith or practice. For that our being persuaded that *Jesus is the* Christ, implies that we apprehend ourselves obliged to embrace for truth whatever was taught by Him and His Apostles, to obey all His laws, to rely upon Him for attainment of all the mercies, and blessings, and rewards, which He promised to dispense, in that order and upon those terms which the Gospel declareth. Whence to the hearty belief of this point such great commendations are given, so high rewards are offered, so excellent privileges are annexed in the Scriptures. Whence also the declaring, proving, and persuading this doctrine was the chief matter of the Apostles' preaching, as both their profession and practice do show." Barrow, if he had clearly apprehended the covenanted titular meaning of the name, might have largely added to this eulogy. For, as our line of scriptural argument indicates, this enables us to interpret and appropriate the promises of the great riches of glory in Christ, Phil. 4 : 19. Commentators and others too much apply this to the present time, when it extends to and embraces the period of His glory *as the manifested Christ*. The riches flow from the Christship of the Jesus, i.e. from the Theocratic relationship that Jesus will openly exhibit and enforce. Hence the promises of future glory, reigning, etc., at His Coming. It is passing strange, and yet in full accord with prediction, that professed believers, who lay special stress on the phrase "No Creed but the Christ," do not even appreciate the meaning of "Christ." The entire grand result of the work of Jesus has for its central idea "the Christ," i.e. when its true scriptural meaning is realized. Without it the Kingdom is nothing; without it Christianity, as the primitive form indicates, loses its logical coherency; without it there can be no historical or doctrinal unity; without it there can be no perfected Redemption or blessed salvation which the prophets predict and faith accepts; and without it all knowledge fails to bring us hope of a world restored to Theocratic rule. We also add, for the critical student, that this title of "Christ," in view of its relationship, enforces the Divine-Human in Jesus.

Obs. 11. The student will notice that the saints who are destined to be "kings" are specially declared to be "*Christ's body*" (Rom. 12 : 5; 1 Cor. 12 : 27; Eph. 1 : 23, and 4 : 12, etc.), and being also "anointed" (2 Cor. 1 : 21; 1 John 2 : 20, 27), they are associated in rule and Kingship (Theocratic ordering) with Him. The Christ is the Head, and is above His "fellows" (Ps. 45 : 7). The honor and exaltation of the body accounted worthy to reign with Him are presented under Props. 154, 153, and 156.

It is not a small thing that Paul, 1 Cor. 3 : 11, asserts that the foundation laid is "Jesus the Christ;" and we cannot help feeling that persons who are savingly united by justifying faith to Jesus, by ignoring the covenanted and predicted meaning of "Christ," and substituting in its place humanly derived meanings, are thus far building on the foundation material, that the Coming again of the Messiah will show to be "wood, hay, stubble." A writer in the *Evangelist* has much to say respecting Millenarian views, running counter to prevailing views, as so polemical and opposed to the method of Jesus.

But in the pure eyes of the writer there is nothing "polemical" in preaching, prayer, hymns, etc., which condemn our doctrine, and substitute a Christ *not covenanted or predicted.* Jesus opposed erroneous doctrine as well as practice, and if compelled to vindicate His honor and glory as connected with His Christship, we only follow His example and the express commands of Scripture. Like the Philadelphians (Rev. 3 : 8) we desire not to deny but uphold, if needs be defend, His name. The very official title of Jesus reminds us also that it should prevent a believer to assume that irreverent and undue familiarity—evidenced by some in the past—with Him in representations of His relations to us and ours to Him. While duly appreciating His nearness, friendship and love, the immeasurable superiority and majesty of "the Christ" should urge us to reverence and respect in address.

Obs. 12. The preaching of the first preachers was that of "the Christ" (Acts 2 : 30, 31, 36 ; 3 : 20 ; 4 : 10 ; 5 : 42, etc.) ; Philip "preached Christ" and "the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 8 : 5, 12) ; Paul "preached Christ" (Acts 9 : 20, 22); in brief, all did as Paul given in Acts 17 : 3, and 18 : 5, 28, and 19 : 4, and 20 : 21, and 28 : 31. This, as we have seen, was *requisite and essential,* for the doctrine cannot be eliminated without destroying the vitality of faith and hope. It was necessary also to give it *due prominency* in order to reach the Jewish heart and the longing of Gentileism for deliverance. We Millenarians are sometimes most unjustly charged as if we did not preach "*the Christ,*" when it is *a most vital point* in our system—*fundamental* to the doctrine of the Kingdom, seeing that without "the Christ" the Kingdom is impossible. We preach not only "Christ crucified" as the means of deliverance, but with Paul we preach "*Jesus Christ and Him (Christ) crucified*" (1 Cor. 2 : 2, and 1 : 23), pointing out *both* what the Christship means and designs (as covenanted and predicted), and then how through faith in a crucified Christ we can attain to an inheritance with Him as "the Christ." With us "*Christ is all in all.*"

It is simply folly to *confine* the preaching of Christ to Him as the Crucified One, for this would leave out the glory of "the Christ," exalting His humiliation and death (so precious as a means) to the exclusion of its design in fitting Him for the Christship, and in drawing those to Him who should participate in the revealed "Christ." Let the reader turn to Paul who uses these expressions, and see how many things, besides the crucifixion, he unites with the idea of "the Christ," and how largely he directs us to the future revelation of Christ, and he must conclude that the title embraces that which we have affirmed. This is clearly seen and acknowledged by our opponents. Thus e.g. Barnes (*Com.*, 2 Cor. 4 : 5) remarks on the words : "We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord," the following : "This important passage, therefore, means that they made it their sole business to make known Jesus as the Messiah or the Christ, as the Supreme Head and Lord of people, i.e. to set forth the Messiahship and the lordship of Jesus of Nazareth." He then tells us to do this implies, (1) to prove that he is the Messiah predicted, (2) to proclaim the truths He taught, (3) to make known the facts of His life, (4) to set forth the design of His death, (5) to proclaim His resurrection, etc., (6) to hold Him forth as Lord. But we show that *more than this* is implied, as e.g. His covenanted relationship as Christ, His position as "the Christ" in the Coming Kingdom, His Judgeship as Christ, etc. Hence it will be seen that our system of faith—which is reproached by some who evidently are unacquainted with it—*makes much of Christ,* and while receiving that which is ordinarily attached to it (as above) includes precious covenanted and predicted truths that other systems either ignore or imperfectly present. Numerous Propositions present a converging testimony to our faith in the Christship of Jesus. May we be so happy as to realize its preciousness in all its fulness.

Obs. 13. The doctrine of the Kingdom evinces the serious defects existing in numerous Lives of Christ. This is seen e.g. in making "the

Christ" a mere doctrinal word, in misapprehending the Kingdom, in substituting a Kingdom, in invalidating the faith and preaching of the disciples, in ignoring the Davidic covenant, in overlooking the postponement, in spiritualizing prophecies, in misapplying the fulfilment of prediction, in exaggerations of the design of the present dispensation, in not evincing the relation that the First Advent sustains to the Second and its results, etc. No one is properly qualified to write such a life, unless acquainted with the doctrine of the Kingdom ; otherwise everything is viewed through a church-Kingdom medium, which injuriously and erroneously affects the truth pertaining to Jesus, the Christ. However valuable and able many such Lives are, the fact is that they are largely vitiated by fundamental errors which forbids the production of *a consistent, Scriptural, covenanted, and predicted Life,* such as the Old Test. foretells and the New Test. imparts.

Many of those lives, aside from such defects, are ably written, contain valuable and suggestive matter, defend much truth against unbelief, and lead us to admire and reverence Jesus. It is, therefore, saddening to point out blemishes and faults, obtained through the entertained theories of an existing Messianic Kingdom as covenanted and predicted, because a sincere admiration of, and indebtedness to, such writers regret to specify anything that may detract from them. Yet faithfulness demands it, for such works—owing to their vast number, extended circulation, and ability of the authors—are moulding the minds of multitudes in opposition to the clear teaching of Scripture respecting "the Christ." The apologies that are frequently presented by them (of which we give in other places various specimens), in behalf of their leaving the plain grammatical sense for a spiritualistic one, are unworthy of the life they describe. Such attempts also only confirm the expression of modern unbelief, as illustrated e.g. in Abbott's *Genius of Christianity and Free Religion,* Potter's *Christianity and its Definitions,* etc. It causes—in view of the alleged changes and transformations—the author of the *Creed of Christendom,* in answer to the question, "Was Christ a divinely-commissioned Teacher of truth?" to answer in the negative, notwithstanding the high eulogies bestowed upon Him as "the wisest, purest, noblest Being," "highest ideal yet presented to us on earth" (while engaged in denying His Christ claims, aspirations, hopes, etc.). To indicate what concessions unbelief gives to the Christ idea, its importance, and the change introduced, we append extracts from two writers. Abbott (*The Genius of Christianity and Free Religion*) says : "It is impossible to doubt that Jesus did actually claim to be the Christ or Messiah, that is, the Founder and Sovereign of the Kingdom of God. So all-pervading is this claim that to eliminate it from the Gospels is to reduce them at once to unadulterated myth. If misunderstood on this point, there is no reason to suppose that Jesus has been understood on any point : if His reported sayings on this subject are genuine, there is no reason to suppose any of His sayings to be genuine. In the words of James Martineau (*National Review,* Ap., 1863), 'Whoever can read the New Test. with a fresh eye must be struck with *the prominence* everywhere of the Messianic idea. It seems to be the ideal framework of the whole—of history, parable, dialogue ; of Pauline reasoning ; of Apocalyptic visions.'" "The Messianic faith is *the soul* of the entire New Test., giving *unity* to the Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse." But he argues—supported by the expressed faith of multitudes—that the original Messianic idea was changed. Such take the apologists (as e.g. Neander's *Life of Christ,* etc.) and adopt largely their views respecting the alleged change. Thus Potter (*Christianity and its Definitions*) remarks : "In that child-like age, among a child-like people, something more was needed than a bare proclamation of moral and spiritual truth, with whatever power of personal genius. And this need was supplied by the old Hebrew conception of the speedy coming of the Messianic Kingdom—a conception that appealed with all the vividness of a drama to the spiritual imagination, and hopes, and fears of men. This idea is *the one thread of unity* that runs through all the varieties of writings in the New Test. from Matthew to Revelation. It was this that gradually lifted Jesus Himself out of all human and historic proportions into the colossal magnitude in which he has been seen by Christendom for eighteen centuries. It was the belief, after His crucifixion, in His *Second Messianic Advent*—an event which His followers looked for in their lifetime—that gave the immediate animating impulse to their cause, and attracted such numbers of people to confess Him as the expected Christ ; for this Advent was to solve all life's trials and perplexities ; it was to

bring redemption to the sinful, rest to the weary, wealth to the destitute, and comfort to the sorrowing. And around this simple childish hope, which was yet full to bursting with the deep life of spiritual aspirations and yearnings, the first Christian Church was gathered—a sect of Judaism accepting Jesus as the Messiah, and looking for His Second Coming to complete and establish His sovereignty." Sustained in his belief that this was a "childish hope" by able and learned Apologists and writers of the life of Jesus, he endeavors to account for the change (which we fully meet in other places) in order to make "Christianity acceptable after it had passed westward beyond the limits of Palestine, and into countries where the Hebrew conception in its original form could have little power."

PROPOSITION 206. *This earth will yet witness the re-establishment of a glorious Theocracy—a Theocracy in its perfected form.*

Our entire line of argument directly founded on the covenants and prophecies of the Old Test., and on the teachings and predictions of the New Test., enforces this Proposition, the hope of ancient believers, of the primitive Church, and of a long and noble line of witnesses for the truth. We will now briefly bring together the converging lines of testimony which present this blessed prospect, so much needed by humanity.

The reader is expected to keep in view the reasoning under the Propositions referred to, seeing that to avoid recapitulation a mere reference is deemed amply sufficient.

Obs. 1. Attention is again called to the fact that this form of government, predicted to be established and to extend itself over the earth, is *a Theocracy*, i.e. God Himself, in the Person of Jesus, the Son of David, rules in it as an earthly Ruler. This form of government is already seen in the Theocracy, initiatory, once established (Props. 25, 26) and which incorporated the Davidic line (Props. 27–33). God was the Supreme Ruler —the earthly King. This fundamental idea must necessarily be retained, *if justice* is done to the direct representations of Scripture, seeing that the entire tenor and analogy of the Record incontestably proves that *the same Theocracy* overthrown, owing to the sinfulness of the nation, shall be *again restored* under the Messiah with increased splendor and power (comp. Props. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36). As the Theocracy must, in the very nature of the case, include *a manifested reign* of God as earthly Ruler and the exhibition of an intimate and abiding union of the civil and religious, this, of course, does not allow us to make the Church, as now constituted, the covenanted Kingdom of the Messiah (comp. Props. 88–104). The Theocracy restored *as covenanted and predicted* through Jesus at His Second Advent, brings forth the Son of David as the actual representative of God manifesting God to us in a pure Theocratic relationship in the Person of One related to humanity—thus adapting it to the necessities of humanity, and insuring its divine and permanent nature (see e.g. Prop. 200). The Theocracy being a form of government in which the State and Church are united, and in which the ruler is accessible as the Head, etc., it follows, as a requisite result, that the Church in this dispensation cannot be the promised Messianic Kingdom, and, therefore, as the Bible declares, this Theocracy when re-established shall be visibly manifested, and the Messiah's reign shall be one visibly exhibited over the earth (comp. e.g. Props. 131 and 168). A Theocracy, such as God Himself has practically explained and enforced, cannot be displaced by a substitution of something else, and it cannot be spiritualized away without doing violence to a thousand promises and calling into question the faithfulness of God.

Under Props. 25–37, etc., attention has been directed to the perversion of the Theocratic idea, and its wholesale appropriation to things that lack its most essential features.

A few additional illustrations are appended to evince the careless handling of the subject. The title of the following work is sufficiently suggestive : *Theocracy, or the Principles of the Jewish Religion and Polity, adapted to all Nations and Times,* by the Rev. Rob. Craig. Objection is justly urged against De Maistre, "On the Pope," claiming for the Pope the office of Sovereign and Infallible Arbiter on the ground of a divinely appointed *Theocratic* ordering exhibited in the Roman Church, but some Protestants just as painfully mistake the Theocratic idea and misapply it, as exemplified even in the title of the following book : *The New England Theocracy ; a History of the Congregationalists of New England to the Revivals of* 1740, by H. F. Uhden, etc., 1859. Unfortunately writers of ability and acknowledged merit, as a multitude of quotations would show, thus pervert the Scriptural meaning, and make the labor of restoring its original import and intent correspondingly harder. The authority of others, and a resulting prejudice, are in the way of appreciating the Scriptural signification and intention of a Theocracy. We need not be surprised that the Papacy (Alzog's *Univ. His.*, vol. 2, p. 490, etc.) should designate itself "a universal Theocracy" or "a system of Theocracy," but it is surprising that Protestantism so largely adopts the same spirit when it (Meyer, etc.) designates the Church as "the Messianic Theocracy," when the fact is, that if we retain the simple meaning and application practically of the Word, nowhere is a Theocracy at present existing on earth, because *God refuses to act* now, for any nation or people, in the capacity of an earthly Ruler. His Divine Sovereignty is one thing ; a special covenanted Theocracy pertaining to this earth is quite another. Hence those writers, who reason that the past establishment of the Theocracy ought to be imitated by a union of Church and State, are most certainly mistaken. Thus Craig, "Theocracy ; or the Principles of the Jewish Religion and Polity adapted to all Nations," while presenting many admirable things, concludes that the Theocracy, as once instituted, is a model designed for future rulers and nations. This is nowhere asserted in the Bible, and cannot be true, since an infallible head and will, which *alone* can control such a union and make it a source of mutual strength, is lacking. The mistakes of the past in this direction, the bitterness, hatred, injury, and bloodshed, sufficiently attest the correctness of our position. It is true that there are certain great principles of law—as many writers have forcibly shown—the rights of man, the social relations, etc., presented, which are worthy of study and reception in practice. But to make it a model in its fundamental Theocratic principles, is certainly erroneous, and productive of great evil. Craig and others mistake when they make the Jewish Theocracy, as such, one of universal application (this is reserved for the future under Christ), and when they assert that Christian nations are equally under a Theocracy like the Jews (Christianity only being preparative to the promised Theocracy). Why is it, that men will so persistently ignore the special features which constitute a Theocracy, and mistake the Universal Sovereignty of God for the special covenanted Kingdom, in which Church and State are united under God as the earthly, accessible, supreme, infallible Head? A writer *North Brit. Review*, May, 1850, p. 143) justly observes that without this "no government should receive the name."

Obs. 2. We press upon the notice of the reader the consistency and reasonableness of such a future Theocracy. The relation that man and this earth sustains to the most High God requires that the honor and majesty of God should demand the establishment of *a Theocracy here on the earth,* by which the race is brought under a government honorable alike to God and man. Our line of argument strongly develops this feature, and the student will appreciate its force, if attention is called to a few points. (1) At the creation God had determined upon this form of government (Props. 1 and 2) ; (2) man by disobedience forfeited a dominion which God through him was to exercise over the earth (Props. 8 and 82) ; (3) God has resolved to restore that dominion in the Person of Jesus, the Second Adam (Prop. 82) ; (4) God—to indicate in what form of government this dominion should be incorporated when restored, to test man's present capacity for it, and to make certain indispensable provisions for the future—erected a Theocracy (Props 25, 26, etc.) ; (5) man, owing to sinfulness, was unfitted for a Theocratic ordering, and, therefore, it was withdrawn (Props. 32, 33, etc.) ; (6) God promised at some future time to

restore it (Props. 33–36); (7) this Theocracy is God's own preference for a form of government, and if not restored makes His proposed government a failure (Prop. 201); (8) God has sent His Son to make provision for Salvation, i.e. to lift man and the race out of the state of rebellion and to restore all the blessings forfeited by the fall (comp. e.g. Props. 196, 182, 144, etc.); (9) this Salvation in its ultimate realization is invariably linked with this still future Coming Kingdom (so e.g. Props. 120, 121, etc.); (10) God, to insure the future permanent establishment of the Theocracy, is preparing a body of rulers for the same to be associated with "the Christ" (Props. 61, 86, 65, and 153); (11) that until this Theocracy is set up the race is not brought into subjection to God (comp. e.g. Props. 176, 152, 204, etc.); (12) however glorious in design this dispensation may be, there is still an incompleteness in Redemption and which will continue until "the Messiah" comes to restore the Theocracy (Props. 87, 88, 120, etc.); (13) when this Theocracy is re-established, then under the rulership of Christ and His saints the race itself is brought into subjection to God—a revolted province is brought back to its pristine allegiance and blessedness (Props. 124, 200, 151, etc.); (14) the Theocracy is the form of government most admirably adapted to secure this result (Props. 128, 116, 117, 119, etc.); (15) a theocracy being in its nature a visible government, such a sovereignty and redemption completed must be visibly shown in the sight of the world, so that—as rightly belongs to God and is done in heaven itself—it be publicly recognized (Props. 121, 122, 131, 154, etc.); (16) the personal relationship of God to Adam in Paradise, to the Theocracy once established in the past, to man in and through Jesus at the First Advent, insures a future special and continued personal relationship in a restored throne and Kingdom (by way of pre-eminence called His own) as exhibiting His Supremacy in the most tangible and satisfactory manner, and that the recovery of a rebellious people and race, as well as the manifestation of God's will being done on earth as in heaven, includes such a personal relationship in the Person of Him who is "the Son of Man" (Props. 81, 86, and 199, 204, etc.).

The offices of Jesus as Prophet, Priest, and King, are united in this Theocracy; the Kingship of the Jews, the Headship of the Church, and the Second Adamship, are so combined in this form of government that they are inseparable, forming One. The swaying of the sceptre in behalf of deliverance over the world includes these relations in *a realized Theocratic sense*, a unity. Hence we do not, in this future state, regard them as separate and distinct one from the other, but united in the same person. For, as shown in detail, this Theocratic reign will result in manifesting, as something actually realized, Jesus as "the Saviour of the World." To day a favorite phrase with many theologians to express the highest phase relating to Jesus, is that of a "Christocracy," but whatever may be asserted respecting the same, it is still true that a "Theocracy" is the more comprehensive term, embracing more, and impressing more specifically the divine and the result of the Christship.

Obs. 3. Nothing but *a real Theocracy* can possibly satisfy the representations given in the Scriptures. Let the reader consider the numerous reasons presented in its behalf, some of which are the following: (1) The actual establishment of a Theocracy which God claims as His special Kingdom, and which He withdraws under promises of future restoration (Props. 25, 33, etc.). (2) The covenant, confirmed by oath, positively demands its future restoration under David's Son (Prop 49). The Kingdom that is covenanted to that future David's Son is not some other

form of government, but *the identical Theocracy* identified with David's throne and Kingdom (Props. 31–33). (3) The postponement of the Kingdom (Props. 66, 67, 87) makes it indisputably certain that this Theocracy will be restored at the return of Jesus. His own words are amply sufficient to sustain our faith in such a blessed expectation. (4) The prophecies, in their plain sense, imperatively demand the Theocracy to be restored (Props. 21, 32, 33, etc.), seeing that the *same* Theocracy overthrown is the one that they declare shall be gloriously re-established. (5) The faith and hope of the pious Jews implies such a regained Theocracy (Props. 20, 40, and 85), because we cannot believe that God would thus incite and foster a false faith and hope by an admitted sense of His Word to be sadly disappointed. No ! He will be faithful to the sense given under His own auspices, and these ancient believers shall yet exult in the full realization of anticipated deliverance and glory in the restored Theocracy. (6) John the Baptist's faith and hope imply the same (Props. 38–41), for it is impossible, without degrading a person "filled with the Holy Ghost" and specially commissioned to preach the Kingdom, to believe that John should utterly misapprehend the nature of the Kingdom he was to proclaim. (7) The doctrinal views of the disciples, apostles, and primitive Church (Props. 43, 44, 70, 71–78), in reference to the Kingdom, were such that they cannot be consistently explained (without lowering their commission, inspiration, and faith), unless we receive their expectations of a future re-established Theocracy to be the truth. (8) The confining by Jesus of the preaching of the Kingdom—its tender—to the Jewish nation (Props. 54, 55, etc.), indicates that the Theocracy, which pertained to them, was the Kingdom offered. Hence, as the very Kingdom tendered to them is the one postponed to the Sec. Advent (Props. 66–68), *the same Kingdom* must be the one ultimately restored. (9) The Kingdom not being established under John's ministry (Prop. 41), not under Christ's (Prop. 56), and not in this dispensation (Props. 70, 71, and 90 to 110) corresponds with the nature of the Theocracy, seeing that no such form of government has yet been witnessed. (10) The design of this dispensation (Prop. 86), the preparatory nature of the Church (Props. 88–105), the gathering out of a people to inherit the Kingdom (Props. 61–65)—these are all points in agreement with our position respecting the future Theocracy, and thus aid in establishing it. (11) A correct understanding of the Divine Sovereignty as something ever existing, and the covenanted Kingdom which that Sovereignty bestows (comp. Props. 79 and 80), enforces the precise idea of a real Theocracy, pertaining to a special rule confined to this earth. (12) A consideration of this Kingdom as belonging, by way of covenant, specifically to "the Son of Man," and what this implies (Prop. 81), brings forward the Theocratic ordering alone as intended. (13) The restoration of the dominion forfeited by the first Adam through the Second Adam (Prop. 82) involves a rule such as we know can only be realized after the Sec. Advent of Jesus, and which the Scriptures unite with this re-established Theocracy. (14) This Theocratic Kingdom is given to Jesus by the Father (Prop. 83), but as a result of His obedience, sufferings, and death (Prop. 84), and, in view of the time of bestowal and the reason for the same, corroborates our faith in an ultimate real Theocracy. (15) The promises to the saints of inheriting this Kingdom (Prop. 90, etc.) at the period of the Sec. Advent, coincide with so many other declarations and predictions relating to this Theocracy and the positions they shall occupy therein, that they corroborate and

strengthen our belief. (16) The Theocracy being Christ's inheritance (Props. 122, 49), and as He has not yet restored the same Theocracy (down-fallen) which all the prophets unite in testifying He will perform, we confidently hold that the Theocracy will be, must be, again manifested. (17) A Pre-Millennial resurrection (Props. 125–129) so admirably fits into the future Theocratic ordering as promised, that the very fact of its being taught and allied with the Kingdom at the Sec. Advent, in order to promote the efficiency, grandeur, and power of the then existing Theocracy, confirms our faith in the same. (18) The inheriting of the earth by the meek (Prop. 142), implies it, seeing that under such a Theocratic ordering and the ruling involved in it, the saints have dominion over all the earth, etc. (19) The predicted place of manifested royalty (Prop. 168) can only be reconciled, without undue violence to the language, with this doctrine of a future Theocracy. (20) The restoration of the Jews (Props. 111–114) unmistakably proves the correctness of our position, because that restoration is indispensable to the re-establishment of the same Theocracy overthrown (the nation being in covenanted relationship to it), and its extension over the world. (21) The supremacy of the Jewish nation (Prop. 114), so clearly taught, can only be explained in view of this future restored Theocracy, seeing that nation is brought into special nearness to it on account of its national covenanted affinity (Props. 24, 29, 30, 54, 55–64) to it. It strongly confirms our doctrine, being just what we might reasonably anticipate. (22) The simple fact that the restoration of forfeited blessings (Prop. 119) is linked by the prophets with this regained Theocracy, materially aids in sustaining our view. (23) These forfeited blessings thus united with the Kingdom can only be introduced by the power of Christ (Prop. 120), and hence, to be fulfilled here on earth as portrayed, necessitates a Pre-Millennial Advent of Jesus. Such an Advent is abundantly taught (Prop. 121), and thus fully sustains our doctrine. (24) The Barren Woman (Prop. 118), as well as many other predictions taken isolated, can only be consistently interpreted in the light of such a future Theocracy in which the saints form a chosen corporate body intimately associated with Christ, and the Jewish nation one that is specially favored by God. Such predictions, therefore, afford additional proof in favor of our position. (25) The prophecies relating to the destruction of Antichrist and the removal of all wickedness (Props. 115, 123, 161, 162, 163), by the personal intervention of Jesus, are only reconcilable with our doctrine of the Kingdom, and form a requisite preliminary to a correct understanding of its introduction and power. (26) The same can be said of the predictions relating to the end of Gentile domination (Prop. 164), which in intent exactly agrees with the predicted Theocratic ordering extending over the world, but cannot be made to fit into the prevailing views of the Kingdom. The very fact that it ends, shows that it is superseded by another form of domination, even the one that we advocate. (27) The predictions pertaining to a visible reign of Christ (Props. 122, 131, 117) are alone perfectly consistent with a restored Theocracy ; they do not fit into any other system of faith and hence are not retained in their plain meaning but are either spiritualized, or made typical of something else. (28) The Judgeship of Jesus (Prop. 132) in all its fulness of detail and richness of power exhibited, can only be predicated of such a Theocracy. Limiting it to simple judicial action is to strip it of its scriptural and Theocratic meaning. (29) The day of judgment (Prop. 133) in its grand results and its wide sweep of juris-

diction, serves to indorse the Theocratic idea. No other belief can incorporate what is stated in reference to it. (30) "The world to come" (Prop. 137) as used by the Jews to designate the restored Theocracy under the Messiah, and its retention and location at the Sec. Advent, shows that our faith is well-grounded. (31) The day of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Prop. 138) designating a period of time after the Sec. Advent, in itself is highly expressive of our view. This time so specially relating to Christ, certainly pertains to an era when His Theocratic reign, as covenanted, is inaugurated. (32) This is strengthened by what is said of "the morning" of "the day of Christ" (Prop. 139) and the events connected therewith—the whole being associated by the prophets with the commencement of such an age still future. (33) "The rest" or "Sabbatism" (Prop. 143) is significant of such a Theocracy, and by the analogy of Scripture is connected therewith. (34) "The end of the age" and the things preceding and following (Prop. 140) are expressive of the beginning and perpetuation of the Theocratic rule. (35) The perpetuity of the earth (Prop. 141) and the perpetuity of the race (Prop. 152), after the Sec. Advent, so essential to this Theocratic idea, are clearly taught and sustain, in simple consistency, the glorious Theocratic rule over the Jewish and Gentile nations. They are doctrines which necessarily must be revealed in order to make the Theocratic rule practicable. (36) The New Heavens and New Earth (Props. 148, 151) united by the prophets with this restored Theocracy, impressively teach what kind of a government Christ exerts over the nations. (37) "The times of Restitution" (Prop. 144), "the Regeneration" (Prop. 145), the deliverance of creation (Prop. 146) are all inseparably connected with the "appearing and Kingdom," i.e. with a Kingdom established here on earth after the sending again of Jesus, that they strongly corroborate the doctrine here advocated. (38) The Transfiguration (Prop. 153), the Temptation of Christ (Prop. 106), the belief in the speedy Advent by the primitive Church (Prop. 74), the Father's house (Prop. 170), the marriage of the Christ to the New Jerusalem (Prop. 169), the perpetuity ascribed to this Kingdom (Prop. 159), these bring forth additional reasons confirming our trust in the plain grammatical sense of the covenants, prophecies, and promises descriptive of *a real* Theocratic government. They indicate the kind of Kingdom intended, its rulers, subjects, and permanence. (39) The visible reign of the saints here on the earth after the Advent over nations, subordinate to the Christ, plainly reveals (Props. 154 and 156) not only the Theocratic rule, but how it is then inaugurated and carried on in a perfected form under perfected rulers, thus insuring its stability and blessedness. (40) The location of the Millennial period (Prop. 158) after the Sec. Advent, can only be made to accommodate itself to our view. To our Theocratic system it is essential; to any other it would be an excrescence. The prophets link their Millennial descriptions with a restored Theocracy. (41) The non-conversion of the world before the Sec. Advent (Prop. 175 and 176) is confirmatory of our position, seeing that, in view of the direct portraiture of this dispensation and of the Church down to the Advent itself, no place is found for the fulfilment of the Millennial predictions; and they must, of necessity, be located where all Scripture places them, viz., after the Advent, and under the instituted Theocratic ordering. (42) Even the very condition of unbelief assumed by the Church and the world (Props. 177, 178, 180) respecting the means to inaugurate the Kingdom and the Kingdom

itself, confirms our faith, seeing that such a state of unbelief in God's predictions, and promises, and mode of procedure, is to be characteristic of the last times. Unbelief in the covenanted and predicted restored Theocratic Kingdom is pre-eminently characteristic of the Church and world today. (43) The translation of the saints, as a preparatory measure (Props. 130 and 118), is only in agreement with a proposed Theocratic ordering, seeing that such a translation is intended to prepare them for a rulership in it. (44) The rudimentary re-organization of the Theocracy at Mt. Sinai (Prop. 166) in the future, the Revelation of the Divine Will (Prop. 167) adapted to this renewed and perfected ordering, the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire (Prop. 171) then experienced, encourage the retention of the ancient faith, because these indicate how we can become suitably prepared to participate in the wonderful out-goings of Theocratic rule. (45) The fact that belief in this restored Theocracy brings forth "the One Hope" (Prop. 182) which sustained a multitude of believers; that it exhibits in this Theocracy a manifested unity (Prop. 184) which never can be realized without it; that it is supported by the analogy of Scripture, the analogy of faith, and the analogy of tradition (Prop. 185) which no other system can claim; that it gives coherency and unity of design to the Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypse (Props. 187–191); that it forms a key to open Scripture (Prop. 192) making much plain that otherwise would be dark; that it does not drive us to deprive the Jews of their retained faith and hope in the plainly expressed predictions of God's Word (Prop. 193), but leads us both by the grammatical sense to accept of a future Theocratic ordering under the Messiah—these things have considerable weight in influencing us to follow the path of pious Jews, martyrs, etc., who longed and prayed for "the Christ" to come and set up His inherited Kingdom. (46) The world's history (Prop. 194) is a mystery and incomplete without this restored Theocracy; for God to undertake a Theocratic form of government and not to complete it, and for Him to promise its restoration and make the most suitable provision for it, and then not to manifest it, would leave a void fatal to the happiness of the individual, of the race, and of the world. (47) When we regard the precious provision made by Jesus (comp. Prop. 195) for this very Theocratic ordering; when we contemplate the Person of Jesus, most wonderfully adapted to secure an exact, pure, real Theocratic rule (Prop. 199), and when we consider the title of Jesus, "the Messiah," "the Christ" (Prop. 205) as alone applicable to a restored Theocracy, we certainly would be lacking faith in God and in His promises if we refused to receive, *cordially and hopefully*, the belief that, at the time determined by the Father, the Messiah shall come again, and fulfil the covenants and predictions relating to the restoration of a fallen Theocracy in a state of glory such as inspired men describe.

The reader is requested to notice the wonderful harmony of our doctrine. Although many things are requisite to give it completeness, every link in the chain of connection is forthcoming and expressed in a plain, easily understood, grammatical sense—*the strongest proof* that can be given to substantiate a doctrine. Aside from the details (in which we may, more or less, mingle error—being human) the grand outlines of the system evidence this harmony of teaching. It is a great gratification, a high comfort, to find such unity between the curse and redemption, the covenants and their realistic fulfilment.

Obs. 4. Briefly, reference may again be made to the *exceeding desirableness* of this future Theocracy. A real Theocracy is one that humanity requires,

and down to its establishment, if we but credit God's foreknowledge as presented in His Word, the nations of the earth will lack a government that can insure continued peace, prosperity, happiness, etc. The sad condition of the world plunged in unbelief and direct hostility to the truth and the Christ (Props. 123, 160, 161, 162, 163, 174, etc.), clearly evinces what the efforts of man at government will yet develop. Let the reader turn to Prop. 202, and notice how the Bible represents to us a Divine government, perfect in every respect, and admirably adapted in every particular to secure stability, blessedness, etc. This is alone met with in *a real Theocracy*, which contains the elements of a complete Kingdom that can lift man and the race from the present low ground into a higher plane, reconciling clashing interests and removing evils, under a visible head and rulership wholly actuated by justice, love, and mercy. The cravings of humanity for a stable government that shall dispense impartial justice and extend its care over all its subjects; that shall bless the highest and the lowest; that shall remove the distress and evils incident to present forms; that shall assure constant and abiding release from oppression, war, and suffering; that shall make a sympathizing and all-powerful ruling Headship constantly accessible to every subject; that shall manifest in a manner to command unfaltering assent, a perfectly reliable and infallible rule; *these can only be realized in a restored Theocracy*—a Kingdom in which God—infinite in wisdom and power—Himself again condescends to act in the capacity of earthly ruler. Who, when viewing the sad history of the nations of the earth (a long, dreary catalogue of jealousies, wars, bloodshed, revolutions, etc.), and regarding the fearful condition and troubles still future (as delineated by the Spirit of God, Props. 161, 162, 163, etc.), does not earnestly desire the speedy Coming of this Theocracy. Again, notice Prop. 204, and see how this restored Theocracy gives definiteness and a continued exaltation to David's Son, and vividly brings before us—as no other system of faith can possibly do—the majestic relationship that He sustains throughout the ages to the race of man. The dignity, honor, and glory of Jesus is promoted by this arrangement; and associated rulers, Jewish and Gentile nations, experiencing the elevation and blessings flowing from this divinely instituted government, shall ever tender to the Father and Son and Spirit ceaseless heart-felt ascriptions of praise.

The reply to those who allege that this Coming to this earth and condescending to act as earthly ruler in the Theocratic order is degrading to David's Son and David's Lord, will be found in Props. 203, 81-85, 200, 197, etc., to which the reader is referred. The objection arises from not discriminating between the Divine Sovereignty (Props. 79 and 80) and this specially covenanted Kingdom to "the Son of Man." It does not see that it is sitting in judgment upon God's own former condescension thus to act, upon God's own preference of government, upon God's oath-bound covenants and predictions relating thereto, and upon the most desirable and glorious method to bring God and man into an intimate and enduring relationship, promotive of the highest glory of the One and the highest blessedness of the other. A believer should hesitate to question such a divine mode of procedure, which must—if duly considered—elevate David's Son to a most honorable position, and which brings glorious deliverance to the world; uniting this fallen and rebellious earth into intimate and enduring relationship—as a recovered province in which God's will is done—with heaven itself, and that by sanctifying and elevating the noblest of earthly relations, the civil and religious in combination. God again "tabernacling with men" as their King, manifesting Himself in the Person of Jesus as Theocratic King; this is *a glory inconceivably great*, and a boon *so full of unutterable blessing* that the heart of man desires it with intense desire. The old view (Farrar's *Life of Christ*, vol. 1, p. 28) of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus, of a powerful King arising in Judea and ruling over the world, will then be fully verified. Plato's (Seiss's *Last*

Times, p. 64) declaration will come to pass: "In the end, lest the world should be plunged into an eternal abyss of confusion, God, the author of the primitive order, will appear again, and resume the reins of empire; then He will change, embellish, and restore the whole frame of nature, and put an end to decay of age, sickness, and death." Some (Froude's *Short Studies*, p. 98) "lament with Father Newman that 'God's control over the world is so indirect and His action so obscure;'" others have their faith sorely tried by past and existing providences, but all this will be rectified when the Theocracy appears. Unbelief levels its sharpest shafts against the "Particularism" of the Bible, the selection of an individual and nation, the neglect apparently of the heathen, the incorporation of an elect body, etc., but then the key to it all will be found in the contemplated end, the Theocratic ordering, and it will be seen that God adopted the best and most speedy means, consistent with man's moral agency, to bring about so glorious a result. We are satisfied, ravished with *the splendid finality* portrayed by the Bible, for it meets a longing of weary ages—a longing impressively expressed in the oft-quoted sentence of Feuerbach: "God is an unutterable sigh out of the depths of the human heart." It meets the often expressed need of a pure, just, and powerful government to take the place of the arbitrary, inconsistent, oppressive and changeable ones of the past.

Obs. 5. The Scriptures are full of this Theocratic idea (as the preceding Propositions show), and many of its declarations receive new force and beauty when viewed in its light. An illustration will indicate this: the expressions relative to God's dwelling with man, and of being their God and they shall be His people, convey the notion of *a Theocratic affinity* entered into by God and experienced by man. This is seen if several particulars are noticed. (1) When the Theocracy was established this feature was thus distinctly announced. Even in Gen. 17 : 8, it is promised that "*I will be their God*" when the land of Canaan should be occupied. Previously to this occupation (as in Gen. 17 : 6, and 26 : 24, and 28 : 13) it had been announced that He would be a God to them in the fulfilment of covenant promises. The full significance of the language begins to appear in Ex. 6 : 7 where God, in view of the Coming Theocracy, tells Moses as a source of encouragement: "I will take you to me for a people, and *I will be to you a God.*" When the Theocratic relationship was entered into at Mt. Sinai, then the idea conveyed in the expression was verified, as stated e.g. in Lev. 27 : 12 "*I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people*" (comp. Ex. 19 : 5, 6 and 29 : 45, etc.). It is admitted by a host of eminent men that this declaration represents God's peculiar and distinguishing relationship to the Jewish nation in the instituted Theocratic government. (2) When the Theocracy was withdrawn, the throne and Kingdom of David fallen down, *then* this language was employed in connection with a predicted restoration of the Davidic throne and Kingdom, or the Theocracy. The reader can verify this by referring e.g. to the following predictions: Ezek. 36 : 28, and 37 : 23, 27; Zeph. 8 : 8; Ezek. 34 : 24, 30 and 11 : 20, etc. It is used by way of pleading with the nation to urge them to repentance, so that it might be realized, as e.g. Ezek. 14 : 11. (3) In this dispensation it is employed to show that believers are brought into such an affinity with God through Christ, that forming His temple, etc., they shall possess this identical Theocratic relationship in the future, as e.g. 2 Cor. 6 : 16; Heb. 8 : 10. For the Scriptures do expressly teach (Props. 90, 86, 118, 124, 154, etc.) that this is fully and perfectly realized when they are exalted in the Coming Kingdom. (4) When the Theocracy is re-established, *then* this language is used as pre-eminently expressive of an actual realization of the Theocratic idea contained in it. Thus it is employed in Rev. 7 : 13, "*He that*

sitteth upon the throne shall dwell among them," but especially in Rev. 21 : 3, "*Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God.*" Certainly, in view of the usage of this language in connection with a Theocracy as once established and with the predictions of the same Theocracy restored, it would be faithless in us not to regard it as *most significant and descriptive of a real Theocracy* ultimately manifested in splendor and power.

This indicates the high calling of the Kingdom in its King, associated Rulers, and subjects, as well as the foundation of the dispensed blessings. This dwelling of God in their midst as Supreme Ruler upon the earth gives the Theocracy its efficacy, and adaptedness, and perfection. It throws light upon Millennial prophecies, illustrative of the Kingdom. Thus : being Theocratic, the civil as well as the religious is divinely administered, and hence everything, even of a political nature, is measured by a divine standard. Therefore, as under the withdrawn Theocracy (that illustrates the spirit of the restored one), every violation is not merely *a crime* but *a sin*, because opposed to the Will of this Head dwelling among them. Faithfulness to the laws of the Kingdom—in every respect—is faithfulness to God, evincing that supreme love whose extension is ultimately to overthrow all disobedience. The rewards and the punishments, as becomes a Theocracy, will then also be immediate, because temporal bestowment of the same evidences the worthiness and power and majesty of the same. The saints, as we have shown, will play an important part in exhibiting this feature.

Obs. 6. This Theocracy is *a predetermined form* of government, which, when the time arrives, will be enforced upon "*a willing people.*" It is not dependent upon the choice of any nation or nations, for, as prophecy predicts, it will be so unwelcome to the nations of the earth that, to establish it, the kingdoms of the world will be broken to pieces by it (thus e.g. Props. 123, 160–163). The ambition, pride, self-exaltation, and wickedness of earthly kingdoms cannot be induced to submit to such a Theocratic rule, and, therefore, the Scriptures plainly predict, as a result, that a fearful conflict will arise (e.g. Props. 162 and 163), which will prove disastrous to the kings and rulers engaged in it. Indeed, a little reflection will evidence that the representations of the Bible in this respect are most reasonable—the only ones that can possibly be anticipated. *Just as* the establishment of the Theocracy in Palestine brought on a conflict with its rulers, *so* the re-establishment of a Theocracy in Palestine (as its centre), destined to extend its sway over all the nations of the earth, must, in the very nature of the case, lead to a serious contest. It is not in the nature of unsanctified humanity to yield up its worldly honors, power, riches, etc., without a struggle—a puny one—against *the pre-ordained government of the Most High God.* The "willing people" associated with the institution of this Theocracy and its continuance are the saints destined for its rulers, the Jewish nation delivered from its drinking the bitter dregs of a long-endured tribulation, and the Gentile nations which shall be made to learn righteousness when God's judgments shall fall upon all who oppose His determined Theocratic ordering. The united opposition of the world, the protests of its rulers and people, *cannot prevent* its introduction and enforcement. Alas ! so blinded is man that but few appreciate its design and adaptation to bless, and it is only when introduced under the auspices of the Theocratic King and His associated rulers, amid opposition and the fall of its enemies, that the eyes of multitudes will be opened to the gran-

deur, majesty, blessedness, and glory pertaining to it, and they will also gladly submit themselves to its ordering.

Some excellent writers have a misleading idea of a Theocracy and of the manner of its establishment. Thus e.g. Wines (*Com. on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews*), in his efforts to show that the American Republic is modelled after the Jewish Theocracy, exceeds the plain statements of the Divine Record. He lays much stress on the compact (Ex. 24 : 3–8 ; Jos. 8 : 30–35 ; Deut. 29 : 9–13, and ch. 24) as proof that the nation had a voice in the government, but overlooks *the vital fact* that the form of government, and the laws proceeding from it, were determined by God—the people had *no voice* in establishing the same. The appreciation of the Deliverer of the nation and of the Founder of the State, with submission to Him, does not make the Theocracy a "Republic." It is derogatory to God's own appointment to make it (p. 118) "the type and model of our own Constitution,' seeing that it is no type but *a real form* of government which God purposes to renew. Even with Wines's typical idea applied to the American Republic, the antitype falls immeasurably below the type in privilege and honor, as in God's condescending to act as the earthly accessible ruling Head. The foundation of a Theocracy is *only in God* and not in the people—the people even at Mt. Sinai developed their unfitness for it, and it was only at the solicitation of Moses that God was again merciful and continued it. It is true, as Wines correctly contends, that human governments act wisely in so far as they incorporate the legislation for the good of all and the protection of the rights of all as evidenced in a Theocracy, but this does not elevate an earthly government to the level of a Theocracy, and we are not at liberty to eulogize our form of government at the expense of the Theocracy.

Obs. 7. The Theocratic idea is so grand in its conception and so sublime in its adaptation to man and its results, that it *could not* have been of human devising. Unbelievers like Rousseau (*Social Contract*, b. 2, ch. 7) make Moses the founder of the Theocracy, and laud "the superior genius of the great man," and his "sagacious and comprehensive power of mind." Believers in the Word employ language in this direction not far removed from the notion that Moses by his own wisdom conceived, and by his own positive spirit practically enforced, the Theocratic idea. Quotations that are painful and degrading to the Record might be produced, illustrative of this loose method of interpreting the Scripture account. If we turn to the Record, while fully admitting the wisdom and ability of Moses, yet it distinctly states that Moses was simply an agent in the hands of God ; that *God Himself* was the direct Founder of the Theocracy, and Moses acted by His command, and under His direction (comp. e.g. Ex. 19 : 3–10 ; Deut. 6 : 20–25, and, in brief, the entire history of its founding). The "divine legation" of Moses is an accepted fact, indisputably supported. This was requisite, for Moses, with all his wisdom and genius, could never have devised *the Theocratic* idea ; as an honorable man it could not have been his work. Consider the God that Moses worshipped, His exalted attributes and His transcendent glory, and how could he, without the grossest presumption, have conceived the idea of His becoming the personal, accessible earthly ruler of the Jewish nation? And to have done so without a direct sanction would compromise his integrity, insult His own God, and found the government on a fearful falsehood. No man of wisdom, genius, and honor could have been guilty of so barefaced a fraud as to palm off his own conception for a God-given one. Indeed, so pure and exalted is the idea in the form presented under the Theocracy, that if it had been imitated, it would have, under the moulding influence of that age of the world, been modified, as seen in other ancient governments that sought a divine sanction of the gods to sustain their polity in the estimation of the governed. The fact is, that the conception is above the individual and the age (forming part

of a Divine Purpose); and the public manner in which the idea was practically inaugurated, and the continued accessibility of the Head, etc., forbid the notion of its human origin. The entire Scriptures constantly refer to it as once established and as again restored *by God*—He being its Founder and Ruler. As we trace this Theocratic idea, we find other distinctive features beyond the conception of finite mind. Thus e.g. it being the Divine Plan to perfect this Theocratic idea in the Person of the King, we discover to our amazement and admiration that to make this Headship accessible and in intimate relationship with humanity—to fit it for such an earthly rulership—the Divine is united with a David's Son, so that in and through Him God exercises just the rule required in a Theocracy adapted to man. Could man develop this conjunction, when e.g. it required a virgin to give birth to a Son, and when it demanded the most intimate acquaintance with the Divine Purpose? Could the prophets or the Apostles bring forth such a magnificent conception of a Theocratic ordering and Theocratic King? No! before it we bow in reverence, acknowledging a divine wisdom and power.

A Theocracy, as the Bible describes, is the grand conception of inspiration. It belongs wholly and essentially to the divine, being a revelation of the Divine Purpose, and strikingly exhibiting the divine in all the preparatory stages and measures until the culmination, when the divine, connected with humanity, appears in overwhelming grandeur and glory. We may well, therefore, dismiss the vain efforts to trace the biblical idea to Oriental religions, to India, Egypt, etc., seeing that nothing approaching such a consecutively developed Theocratic Plan is to be found anywhere outside of the Bible. It is God's idea, not man's; it is God's work and not man's; to Him we gratefully and joyfully attribute all honor and praise.

Obs. 8. This Theocracy, when once again established, is *permanent*. This has been proven in detail (Prop. 159), but we may briefly present one feature which alone assures us of its stability. One source of the weakness of human governments is the perpetual change of rulers and dynasties, owing to mortality, revolutions, etc. Now the King is immortal and divine, and no change can be predicated of Him; the associated rulers being made like unto Him, immortal and glorified, their positions are perpetual. A distinguishing peculiarity of this restored Theocracy is that the rulers are all chosen by God Himself; no one can ever be a king or priest in it without God's direct appointment. The people have no voice in the selection of the rulers,[1] and hence there is no possibility of introducing those who are unworthy. God selects His rulers from faithful and tried ones—they are the true brethren of the King (Props. 90, 154, 124, 153). This immeasurably enhances the efficiency and stability of the Theocracy. When the Apostles reign over the twelve tribes of Israel, when the saints are allotted their position of judges, when the rulers of the Kingdom disseminate and enforce the ordering prescribed, there is no power capable of resisting them, and there is no element that can disturb their sway—being founded in Omnipotence itself.[2]

[1] Wines (*Com. on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews*) makes it the highest crowning excellence of a government that the people are permitted to choose the rulers (God, however, in view of the past history of nations, judges otherwise), and makes a desperate effort (because God to some extent allowed this in the former Theocracy) to show that this pertains *essentially* to a Theocracy. We are certain that it does not *to a perfected* Theocracy; and we are confident that it did not belong to the past Theocracy *to the extent* that he claims. A few statements will evidence the latter fact. We have seen that the form of

government and the laws came from God (the people appointed no representatives to choose the form and frame the code under which they were to live), and that the people —as would be proper under any form—gave in their willingness to yield obedience to the same. The next step was the appointment of rulers, and, instead of the people selecting the chief magistrate, *God* both selects and commissions Moses as the chief ruler under Himself. Moses, by God's express direction, selects and commissions Joshua. The Theocracy did form classes that held superior positions and privileges (and these hereditary), it gave the judges position for life, it ultimately incorporated and upheld even *a hereditary line of kings*. All these were to perform, not what the people might demand, but what *God's own laws* required. We cannot help therefore to express our surprise that Wines should (p. 138) call the Theocracy "a Republic," and in his ardor declare that "in Palestine *the nation* governed," and that "on the banner of Palestine flamed, in living letters, liberty, equality, fraternity." In several places he eulogizes the American Republic as a copy of the Theocracy, because as he asserts *both* are based on "the capacity of the people for self-government," emphatically declaring that "men are capable of governing themselves; such is the decision of the infinite intelligence;" and then proceeds to predict a glorious future for the world founded on this "capacity of self-government," issuing by its adoption into "the political redemption of the race," etc. A few additional remarks, expressive of *entire dissent*, may be in place. (1) These assumptions are based on a misconception of the foundation of a Theocracy; if it was a Republic then it could not be a Theocracy; if the people governed, then God was not the highest Ruler. (2) If it was "a Republic" founded on "self-government," how comes it that the nation could not choose the code or change it, that God selected rulers and imposed them, and that ultimately kings, in a hereditary line, were incorporated. (3) When the Jewish nation rebelled against God's government and determined to exercise its own judgment in opposition to God's polity, it manifested in the results, no "capacity for self-government." (4) The form of the future restored Theocracy as covenanted and predicted, as well as the form of the one withdrawn, evinces "the decision of the infinite Intelligence" that "men are" not "capable of governing themselves." (5) The history of the past sadly evidences, that men, owing to depravity, are incapable of doing it in a way to secure continued prosperity, etc. (6) The American Republic is no exception yet, seeing that it is only in its infancy, that it barely escaped disruption in the past, that elements and diversity of interests are at work which cause statesmen to feel that the capacity of self-government has not been sufficiently tested to base upon it an infallible evidence of permanency and progress. (7) The predictions of the Bible positively declare that instead of such a future as Wines predicts, *the exact reverse* (in the nations being led by the Antichrist, etc.) shall be experienced, and this is amply sufficient, for God alone foreknows the future. (8) The ending of Gentile domination and the Theocratic rule substituted, unmistakably shows what estimate we are to place on such predictions.

[2] Owing to human depravity and the Theocracy being subordinately ruled by fallible men, there was an element of danger in the former one (pointed out by Michaelis, *Com. on the Laws of Moses*, art. 46, and by Wines, *Com. on the Laws*, etc., p. 509, etc.), viz., of two tribes when becoming more powerful than others, regarding each other with suspicion and hatred, or when one tribe acquired ascendency over the rest, the others would be excited by envy, etc. Illustrations are given of this in the works named. But this danger shall be averted in the future Theocracy, as e.g. *plainly predicted* by Isaiah 11 : 13. The reason for this change is found in the fact that the King and all the rulers being immortal, pervaded by the Spirit, perfect, and perpetual in office, no place is given to that ambition and jealousy for position, honors, etc., that is so unfortunately and fatally developed in earthly kingdoms. Jealousy, envy, and rebellion cannot exist; all, too, are under the sway, counsel, and protection of perfect, God-consecrated rulers, and hence no antagonism, injustice, oppression, arbitrary measures can exist.

Obs. 9. The manner in which God regards the world's history, as presented in His Word, indicates *the high estimate* that He places on this Theocratic idea. Infidels have rudely assaulted the Theocracy in the past (overlooking that it only foreshadowed in a real initiatory form the grand Theocratic ordering to be realized), and Apologists have lamely apologized (as e.g. suited by way of accommodation to a transition state) in its behalf; but the reverent student of the Scriptures, tracing the Divine Purpose, sees

in it *the foundation* of Jewish greatness, past and future, and ultimately the world's redemption and glory. *Why* does God so carefully trace the rise and progress of the Jewish nation to the establishment of the Theocracy, then enter into fulness of detail respecting the Theocracy, its history and downfall; then avoiding any connected history of the nation so long as separated from the form of government He Himself instituted, He only presents a sufficiency to give coherency to predictions and preparations relating to the future? *Why* does God specially single out this Jewish nation as alone worthy of detailed mention, and pass by those mighty nations (with brief mention) that existed contemporaneously? *Why* does He devote so many pages to a special form of government, and pass by those forms which largely fill the pages of profane history and which played such a prominent part in the world's drama? Such questions are only satisfactorily answered by a reference to the Theocratic ordering. The Jewish nation being directly under God's own Kingdom, sustaining to Him a near national relationship as the Ruler, He, for the sake of *His own Theocratic position*, once occupied and to be again re-occupied, evinces this partiality to the nation in the recorded history. When history shall be read and studied after the thousand years are ended, the significancy of all this and the manifest omission respecting other governments and nations of vast proportions will appear self-evident in the then existing grandeur of the Theocracy, the restoration and supremacy of the Jewish nation, and in the Gentile nations having participated in its blessings.

The reason why God did not reveal Himself directly to other nations as He did to the Jews—a problem, the subject of much thought to various writers—*is found in this Theocratic idea.* They were utterly unfitted for it, even as the Jews, although having a previous preparation of wonderful manner, evidenced themselves to be unworthy of its permanent retention in the form first presented. It was, therefore, as a preparatory measure, brought out in the Jewish line in order to provide for the Theocratic King, David's Son, etc. So much is this felt that unbelief has sneeringly said, that the Old Test. contains a "Civil Theology." A recent writer on "Natural Religion" (*Littell's Liv. Age*, Oct. 28th, 1876, p. 222), referring to it as a distinguishing peculiarity of the Bible, that it occupies itself so much with the future on earth, remarks. "The future is their study, but not—this is almost as true of the New Test. as of the Old—the future after death. It is a kind of *political future* that absorbs them, the fall of kingdoms and tyrants, of Babylon, Epiphanes, Nero, and the Roman Empire, the future of Jerusalem, the expected return of Christ to reign upon the earth." The Theocratic idea gives us *the full explanation* of such a position, and this, so objectionable to unbelief, enforces our argument and answers all objections. Hope—prophetic and believing hope—looks forward to a Theocratic Kingdom with an infallible and majestic Head, with subordinate rulers glorified and freed from imperfection, with righteous laws seeking the interests and happiness of all, with blessings so complete that the highest pleasure will be to do the Divine Will.

Obs. 10. This Theocracy has a *politico-religious* constitution, i.e. a constitution inseparably connected with the worship of God, for God in the Person of "the Christ" is King. Hence idolatry is treason, and will be swiftly punished, for it is aimed directly at the Divine King and the foundation of His government. It possesses a constituted, manifested unity, the same centring in an infallible, ever just, and beneficent Head, which seeks the welfare and happiness of all classes from the lowest to the highest. This unity is preserved by the oneness of mind and heart, cemented by redemptive love, existing between the King and His associated rulers. It bestows liberty, but only in the sense that it allows whatever the

public good requires and whatever pertains to the good of the individual himself, i.e. whatever is consistent with the rights of the State, society, and individual. Freedom consistent with the benefit and happiness of all is the only liberty, as the greatest of statesmen have shown, that ought to pertain to a State striving to become a blessing to its subjects. A perfect State should be, in its ruling Head, in close sympathy with its people, and this is *pre-eminently* true of this Theocracy. With a King who suffered in humanity and died for man, and with subordinate rulers who passed through the trials incident to an earthly pilgrimage, we have a body of rulers *who can and will sympathize* with the people, and manifest it by the power exerted in their behalf. The very form of government under the guidance of infallibility will secure the rights, privileges, and blessings of all—of rulers to rank and position, of subjects to property, soil, etc., so that all shall feel an abiding interest in the perpetuity of the united State and Church. The happiness of all being secured, all are influenced to love the polity introduced, which cares for the welfare of all. Alienation of estate, utter deprivation of property, galling indebtedness, servile vassalage (as shown by the Jubilee year) cannot find their counterpart in this Divine Polity, for then "*they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid*" (Mic. 4 : 4). The Agrarian law of the Theocracy, which divided the land equally among all, and prevented that enormous accumulation of landed estate in the hands of the few to the detriment of the many, may reasonably give us a hint how in the future the earth will be occupied by the subjects. In the past Theocracy there were no standing armies and no provision made for them, because the King Himself was the defence ; this is true of the Coming One, when the Omnipotent King and His rulers inaugurate by their august presence and action an era when the nations and people "*shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks : nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more*" (Isa. 2 : 4 ; Mic. 4 : 3). Public worship and religious institutions are an integral part of a Theocratic Polity, for in it State and Church are firmly united and blended ; hence, in the delineations of the restored Theocracy this feature assumes a very deservedly prominent place. All nations falling under its sway and enjoying its blessings must publicly worship the Ruler, thus acknowledging their dependence, indebtedness, gratitude, love, and reverence as subjects (see e.g. Zech. 14 : 16 ; Isa. 60 : 6, 7 ; Rev. 21 : 24 ; Isa. 66 : 23, etc.).

Then is verified what even men not Millenarian, as Neander and many others, have insisted on as imperative in order to fulfil *the plain predictions* of Scripture, viz., that the Church must come in possession of "*a world-wide dominion,*" but fail to inform us how it is possible to possess the dominion as delineated by the prophets without the conjunction of the civil ; and how, if the latter is once admitted, it is possible to co-ordinate them—owing to human infirmity—without this identical Theocratic ordering, seeing that, according to the Scriptures, nations shall be averse to it down to the Sec. Advent. Rothe (so others) correctly insists on it that *the highest possible* condition of government is a perfect union of the Church and State. Here alone it can be realized ; for vain is it to expect such a revolution without the direct intervention of the appointed Theocratic King. The Scriptures are too direct upon this point to cause us to mistake its meaning. Schaff (*His. Apos. Ch.*, p. 15), speaking of the Church and its ultimate union with, and control over the State, says : "History in this view is to end in *a Theocracy* in which all dominion and power shall be given to the saints of the most High, all nations be united into one family, and joyfully yield themselves to the divine Will as their only law." We show from covenant and promise how this will be realized. In the nature of the case

the legislation of such a Theocracy cannot be tampered with, for it embraces the Divine Will. Hence in it no crushing monopolies can exist; men, women, and children will not be converted into mere machines to add to others' wealth; it does not, owing to its Supernatural basis of immortal and glorified rulers, grind down its subjects with taxes to support its governmental machinery; it will not, like present governments, force an opium trade upon some nation at the cannon's mouth, or obtain revenues by indorsing things which tend to moral and social degradation. Religion, inestimable as it is, is only the earnest of the purity of that Theocracy which incorporating religion in its highest development with the magnificent civil pertaining to the government of the world, manifests and disseminates civil and religious, spiritual and temporal, individual, social, and national blessings. The consideration of personal salvation, however precious, should not hinder a due view and appreciation of the Divine Purpose in Redemption as exhibited in this Theocratic ordering. This would be religious selfishness, leaving out the most glorious results. And we must not forget that in the restoration of the Theocracy important changes, as predicted, will be made. The Theocracy that once existed was rudimentary, the Theocracy that comes will be perfected; the Theocracy that was withdrawn only gave certain outlines to be filled out, being accommodated, preparatory to Redemption, to the circumstances of the nation and the times; while the Theocracy to be erected retains the grand outlines with the most splendid additions to adapt it to the King, rulers, nations, and new dispensation. Hence in judging of the past, due allowance must be made between the fundamentals of a Theocratic government and the incidentals incorporated in view of the state of the Jewish nation and the world. The fundamental must be discriminated from the preparatory, typical, and initiatory. We can readily perceive certain principles that underlie such a government, which, in the nature of the case, never can be yielded without destroying the very idea of a Theocracy, such as God acting in the capacity of an earthly, civil ruler; the Church and State united in one; the subordinate rulers and the people subjected to a supreme perfect Will; such a Will offering an infallible guidance; the rights and privileges of the highest and lowest are respected and protected; that every one under its laws has access, either personally or by chosen representatives, to the Head of the government; that the Chief Ruler dwells with His people and is their God; that the happiness and welfare of all are duly regarded and promoted. Infidels of all classes have made certain features of the Theocratic Kingdom a reproduction of superstition, or devices to secure the power of the priesthood and rulers. They object to certain laws, and brand them as "detestable, absurd, tyrannical," but such statements, as writers like Wines, Michaelis, etc., show, originate from a disinclination—if not aversion—to receive the obligations imposed by a concession to the divine claims of the Bible, and from a persistent refusal to credit the simple fact that the government as instituted was rudimentary (being then the best adapted) to the promised future, glorious expansion. So now, no one can heartily accept of the predicted Theocracy in all its aspects who is not willing to make God's Will supreme, or receive the Divine Purpose *as covenanted and predicted*, unless his mind and heart is submissive to revealed truth.

Obs. 11. A Theocracy, in the very nature of the case, cannot tolerate any other form of government. If the earthly King is the Mighty Creator, the Redeemer, the Renewer, etc., then a Kingdom specially designed to promote His own glory and the good of His creatures cannot endure the existence of kingdoms of human origin and pervaded by human infirmity. Even this feature was to some extent manifested in the initiatory Theocracy of the past. It is sometimes said that the laws of the same were cruel, unjust, etc. Leaving Wines (*Com. on Laws*, B. 1, ch. 6), Spring (*Oblig. of the World to the Bible*, Lect. 3), and others to show, by contrast with the most polished nations, by the merciful laws incorporated, etc., that the charge is pressed to an undue extent, yet they fail to vindicate the same from *the proper Theocratic* standpoint. It cannot be denied that the charge given by God was to utterly root out and exterminate the nations of Canaan, and the reason actuating the King of the Theocracy is plainly given, in that the retention of those nations and kingdoms with their wickedness was in direct conflict with His own government, and would

necessarily result in leading His own subjects astray and in open rebellion. The very prohibition and apparent cruelty toward the nations of Palestine is made necessary by *the foundation principle of a Theocracy*, and its presence and requirement is additional proof of *the actual* Theocratic idea having been realized and of the divine inspiration purposing it. Indeed, the history of the nation proves that the violation of this very feature weakened, and ultimately proved disastrous to, the Theocratic ordering. It is in the nature of a Theocracy to avoid all that can possibly affect due allegiance to the Supreme Ruler, and, from the necessity of self-preservation and the retention of its honor, dignity, power, etc., it must meet heinous sin, crime, and rebellion with merited punishment. This gives us *the key* to those terrible predictions relating to the future, in which it is positively asserted that the kings and their armies shall be overthrown, and the kingdoms of the earth shall be utterly broken, etc. Men, when reading the prophecies (see e.g. Props. 163, 162, 161, 160, 123, etc.) which describe the Coming of the Theocratic King and His associated rulers in connection with the awful period of war (Props. 115, 163), followed by the subversion and end of the Gentile domination, vainly imagine that such a period of violence, slaughter, and destruction must be an Oriental exaggeration ; but the reverent believer, accepting of the Theocratic idea to be again realized, sees that in the establishment of such a Kingdom *it must necessarily lead to this result*, because its nature forbids its allowing the existence of governments that would, if permitted to survive, be a constant invitation to His subjects to withdraw from their allegiance, etc. The setting up of a Theocracy, when the world is governed by kingdoms under the sway of earthly motives and principles, must inevitably produce *the mighty convulsions* predicted, and these predictions themselves, so consonant to reason and the Theocratic idea, are evidence of divine inspiration.

Hence *the plain* predictions of the punishment of nations if they resist acknowledging allegiance, and even of their *utterly perishing* if they persist in it, as seen e.g. in Zech. 14 : 12–19 ; Isa. 60 : 12, etc. Therefore it also will not tolerate the treason of the individual, but metes out to him condign punishment, and, if persevering in rebellion, finally death. We read that mercy and long-suffering will be extended to him for the time allotted to man in this dispensation, for e.g. Isa. 65 : 20 declares that in the New Heavens and New Earth "*the sinner a hundred years old shall be accursed.*" We remind the critical student what light this throws on the subject of the temporal punishments of the past Theocracy, and which are so unfairly used against the inspiration of the Scriptures. A Theocracy, in the very nature of the case, must thus mete out, in defence of its fundamental idea, these temporal punishments, and it will do it again until the world is brought into complete subjection. The punishments regarded in their connection to the actual Kingdom of God existing *pertain to this earth*, and it is a most powerful proof of the inspiration of God's Word that it thus remains so faithful and consistent to the Theocratic ordering. Mistaking the nature of the covenants and Kingdom leads men to utterly misapprehend the proprieties of language and the undeviating exactness to fundamental ideas.

Obs. 12. Another feature connected with the Theocracy may be mentioned as indicative of the Divine Power abiding with it. Let the reader turn to Prop. 171 and see how the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire is *a distinguishing honor and privilege* accorded in this Kingdom. In the former Theocracy prophets were raised up, and, as writers of eminence have justly observed, they were so directly influenced by the Theocratic King, that as special divine messengers their authority could not be resisted (comp. Wines's *Com.*, p. 624, etc., who refers to Coleridge, Schlosser,

Horne, Alexander, and Milton) "without abjuring *the fundamental principles of the Theocracy.*" Wines (*Com.*, B. 2, ch. 9), Michaelis (*Com.*, art. 36), Alexander (*Introd. Isa.*, p. 12), and others hold, from the institution of the prophetical order (Deut. 18 : 9–22), that God designed "a constant succession of inspired men" and "a permanent order of (such) men in the Israelitish commonwealth." This was perverted by the rebellion and perversity of the nation, although God vouchsafed in mercy not to overlook them entirely—until after a sufficiency was given—when, as an indication of disapprobation, He left them without a prophet. We believe that this position is eminently correct, viz., that the Theocratic ordering—to evidence the pervading Theocratic influence (which Balaam, when he came to view the nation, could not withstand), and to extend its efficiency (as e.g. in revealing the will and purpose of the King, etc.)—incorporates such a succession as part of its working instrumentalities promotive of the honor of the King and the wisdom and good of His subjects. Thus it will be again (Prop. 171), and so general (Joel, etc.) and continued that it in itself evinces a most powerful present Theocratic arrangement. This is one of the concomitants of a Theocracy, and affords an insight into *the splendid portraiture* of the wonderful operations of the Holy Spirit during that period, and the astounding moral, religious, and civil results flowing from the imparting of divine wisdom for the guidance, instruction, and elevation of the nations.

Hence we cannot agree with those who—without perhaps intending it—virtually lower the prophetic office by making it merely the concomitant of the childhood of the nation, an accommodation to counteract the ancient desire and propensity to look into the future, etc. Even under the light that we now possess, how welcome would be *the authoritative* utterance of a prophet to inform us of the exact truth of things concerning which the pious and the great so widely differ. The prophetic office has a deeper foundation than this, viz., in the testimony that it affords of a pervading Theocratic ordering. All divine prophecy is based on speaking in the name of Jehovah ; it is a revealing that which comes from God the ruler of the Kingdom. It therefore evinces the nearness of God, and when He comes again to dwell with men, this *nighness* is evidenced by the re-bestowal of the gift of prophecy. The reader is reminded of the affiliation of this prophetic order with the Theocracy by the simple fact, that the assumption of the prophetical office without being divinely called, was (Michaelis, *Com.*, arts. 252 and 253) treason to the State, and hence the severity of the penalty, death. The ordinary reader, confining his attention too exclusively to certain inspired ones (as the seventy elders, etc.) and not comparing the Scriptures on the subject, is led to form an incorrect opinion of the extent of this order in the former commonwealth. Writers who have examined this feature (as Michaelis and Wines in their *Coms.*, Calmet in "Diss. on the Schools of the Hebrews," sec. 11, etc.), say that they formed "a numerous body in the State." Owing to the infirmity of subordinate rulers, etc., we have intimations of pretenders arising, which the future Theocracy, in virtue of its perfected ordering, is freed from.

Obs. 13. The student will not fail to observe that our doctrine of the Kingdom, embracing this realized Theocratic idea, is not dependent on the statement of Rev. 20 : 1–6. This latter Scripture, so precious in stating one of the means of its inauguration, etc., might be entirely omitted without in the slightest degree affecting *the abundant proof* that covenants, predictions, and promises afford. Hence we cannot but regard those who so confidently affirm that our doctrine is founded on Rev. 20 : 1–6 as but slightly acquainted with it. The numerous Propositions of this work, the logical procedure, step by step, with the proof attached, the history of the doctrine, with the declarations of its ancient and modern upholders, the Scriptures produced from the Old and New Testaments—elevate the Theo-

cratic idea into a cardinal and central one—into such a majestic proportion, that it contains the manifestation of the Divine Purpose, that it is futile to attempt to dwarf it into the narrow boundary suggested. The Pre-Millennial resurrection is only a means necessary to secure a part of the rulers of this Kingdom; the idea of the Kingdom is not to be sought for in the means used for its re-introduction, but lies firmly imbedded *in the oath-bound covenant of God.*

The Jews always allied salvation with the restoration of the Theocratic Kingdom; with that restoration they connected the resurrection of the pious, a glorious Redemption. This we have proven in former Propositions, is the Old Test. teaching. Is salvation separate from the Theocratic Kingdom now, or will the resurrection of saints be not realized at its re-establishment? No! covenant, prophecy, and promise forbid it. The Theocracy of the past (established to evidence God's own chosen form of government, and to show that man as now constituted is incapable of properly appreciating and perpetuating it), could not be sustained because of man's love for sin and guilt, which caused its withdrawal. Before it can be restored to its perfected, covenanted form to remain *a permanency,* there must be raised up for it a body of rulers who shall be permanently delivered both from the love of sin and its guilt (Prop. 124). The Theocracy of the past foreshadowed this, and in its typical and sacrificial applications made a remarkable provision in this direction. But something more was required to bring this work to a successful issue, in order to vindicate the majesty of the law and to qualify these rulers for their future position. To whom can this work be intrusted? Who so well qualified, so eminently adapted, as the Theocratic King Himself? Sinless, Divine-Human, Theocratic Head, He is alone qualified to raise up a body of true believers to be associated with Him in the highest and noblest of relations. This is implied, predicted, and promised irrespective of the Apocalypse, the latter being only strongly confirmatory. Hence as a preliminary to the future Theocracy, as an essential work to secure its stability and holiness, as a prerequisite to cause the will of God to be done on earth as it is done in heaven, He, the King, tenders Himself as a sacrifice for His people, so that by faith in Him they might be justified, made holy, receive the better resurrection, and obtain the salvation and glory inseparably connected with His Kingdom. Here is presented the amazing condescension, the astounding love of the King! Reason cannot conceive of a more matchless demonstration, and yet this is the very one contemplated in the Divine Purpose from the beginning, and clearly stated in the Old as well as the New Test.

Obs. 14. We need not enumerate *the distinguishing blessings* that will be restored in and be added to the Theocracy, for these have been given (Props. 36, 49, 105, 114, 116, 117, 119, 120, 122, 142, 143, 144, 146, 151, 154, 156, 157, 159, 167, 168, 169, 171, 173, 176, 182, 184, 196, 200, 202, 204, and others). These representations, founded in God's faithfulness, inspire us with *the confident hope* that when this Theocracy is realized we shall receive far higher blessings than we even forfeited at the fall, and this, that the Mighty King over us may Himself be honored and praised in and through us. Passing over the Divine Plan as it culminates in this Kingdom, we have found not merely perfected redemption, but a redemption which superadds Sonship, Kingship, and Priesthood—the highest, most intimate, and enduring union with the Theocratic ruler—*the most exalted conceivable relationship* with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and all this becomes a priceless, eternal inheritance. Under its light and glory the nations of the earth shall experience the deliverance and blessedness that a Theocracy alone is capable of bringing to a burdened, groaning humanity.

Aside from the gradual removal of the curse from the earth, and the ultimate destruction of the last enemy after the thousand years, etc., which has been sufficiently represented, we may confidently expect that in the revelation of the majestic King, in whom

the divine and human are united, and of the glorified rulers made "equal unto angels," then the great underlying mysteries which for ages have eluded the grasp of the theologian, philosopher, and scientist will be revealed. The relation e.g. that mind sustains to matter—a mystery in man, and preserved such in order to keep man humble before the higher mystery of God's Omnipresent Will in and over natural law—will then in the Person of "the Christ" and in the persons of His associated rulers, receive its long wished for solution. The Scriptures indicate this in the predictions representing the manifested power of the King and His subordinates. Then, too, will be realized what Reuss (*His. Ch. Theol. Apos. Age*, p. 29) says of the Theocracy: "The fundamental and formative idea of the prophetic teaching was that of the Theocracy." (Why then change it by a substitution?). "The prophets set forth as the end or law of that national life, a state of society in which all the citizens should be brought into a direct relation with Jehovah, accepting His Will as the sole rule of their actions, whether collective or individual, and receiving in return for this unbounded obedience, the promise of peculiar divine protection. Israel, according to this ideal conception of it, was to be a people of saints and priests." This "ideal conception," which comes from God, will, as God's Word is truth, be finally practically verified, and then shall Gen. 12 : 3 ; 18 : 18, and 28 : 14, etc., be accomplished in all its fulness.

Obs. 15. Finally: "The Christ" is the crowning excellence of the Theocracy; He is "*the chief corner-stone*," "*the Head of the corner*," the Stone that crowns the apex of the building. The builders (Matt. 21 : 42, 43, i.e. the Jewish nation to whom the Kingdom was tendered by Jesus, and upon whose repentance depended the securing of this building—see Props. 54–59) rejected this stone, and therefore others are called, and when the number pre-determined by God are gathered (Props. 65, 66, 124, etc.), then He becomes the glorious Head-stone. Again we say, He is "all and in all;" without Him the Theocracy and its blessings, as covenanted, could not possibly exist. In "the Christship" (Props. 205, 204, 199) we have *the fundamental idea* of the Theocratic ordering, viz., God again ruling as a King over the nations—an actual, real, accessible King. Look at the representations of the prophets in this direction, and obtain an overwhelming proof of the Divinity of Jesus and a correct view of the requirements *essential* to a Theocratic King. He must indeed be, as has been abundantly proven, David's Son, and thus Human; but He must also be God, and thus able to rule Theocratically. The prophets insist upon this human nature, and they press it as so essential that all men, Jews and Gentiles, have fully admitted that "the Messiah" must be a descendant of David's. This Messiah is to be the Head of the restored Theocracy. But see how the same prophets describe this Ruler as "God," as "the Lord God," etc., and bestow upon Him—the Coming One—the title, dignity, honor, and glory *of God Himself*. A multitude of passages which, similar to Zeph. 3 : 15, 17, declare that when this Kingdom is set up "*the King of Israel, even the Lord, is in the midst of thee*," "*the Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty*," clearly show that this Messiah is a God-man. The student will find this an exceeding rich vein from which to adduce the divinity of "the Christ," for the Lord God that cometh in vengeance and for redemption is this self-same appointed Messiah. Now, why do the prophets bring forth this grand conception as if it was a matter *so plain* that it needs no explanation? Simply because it is rooted and grounded in *the Theocratic conception*, for *no Theocracy* can be restored without *God* being its acknowledged earthly Ruler. This very language, which unbelief has presented as specimens of Oriental exaggeration, is profound and truthful in meaning. They form another of those indirect but powerful proofs which sustain the inspiration of the Scriptures. Now, see *how* Jesus, as described in

the New Test., meets all these qualifications in His own Person ; *how* such a Messiah has actually been provided ; *how* the fulfilment of the remainder is postponed to the Sec. Coming of this Christ ; *how* the builders that rejected Him have borne their sad punishment for eighteen centuries ; *how* the process of gathering out His intended associated rulers is going on, etc., and *then how* can we reject *this Theocratic King and the contemplated, predetermined, covenanted Theocracy.* No ! we cannot ; our minds and hearts cleave to Him and to His predicted Kingdom with all our strength. With an eye of faith and a heart of hope we look for a Theocracy—for God Himself, in the Person of Jesus, to come and in wonderful condescension and love to rule over the nations as *their actual earthly Ruler.* What honor, what blessedness, what glory, what endless joy are embraced in a single word realized, *a Theocracy*, and in a single person the Head of the same, even *Jesus "the Christ," the mighty Theocratic King, "the Just One," "Faithful and True."*

Jesus Himself will *greatly rejoice* in this Theocracy. As David's Son and Lord, it is His inheritance and work. In it He sees the grand result of the travail of His soul, and He is satisfied. In it He realizes "the joy set before Him," and He is exalted in honor and glory. In it He is the centre of admiration and praise, the love and devotion of the glorified, of the Jewish nation, and of the Gentiles being drawn to Him. The restitution, blessings, and perpetuity of His dominion, the constant realization that He Himself is a flowing fountain of happiness and delight to ransomed ones and to the nations of the earth, this enables Him to rejoice evermore, through "the ages of ages." Evermore King, He is ennobled by His civil relationship ; evermore Priest, He is glorified by His religious Headship ; evermore King-Priest, He is exalted by *the perfect Theocratic unity centred in His own Person and Reign.*

CONCLUSION.

THUS, by God's grace, we have passed over the great, leading Biblical doctrine of the Kingdom of God—a Kingdom covenanted, established, overthrown, predicted, preached, postponed, and finally gloriously re-established under the mighty Theocratic King. We have, logically and consecutively, traced the Kingdom of God, finding it based upon the covenants, instituted in an initiatory form, modified in the Davidic incorporation, overthrown for man's sinfulness, tendered to the elect nation, but rejected, postponed to the period of the Sec. Advent, and finally re-established with great power and glory by David's Son and Lord. In it is found an incorporated perfected humanity insuring success, a human society under divine guidance, a civil and religious government under a Theocracy, a satisfactory completion of redemption, a triumphant conclusion of history and of God's perfected Purpose in "the Christ." We have honored the Word of God, by our constant appeal to it, as the all-sufficient and infallible rule of faith and practice, and trust that (comp. Luther's and Augustine's declarations as given by Dr. Sprecher in *Groundwork of Theology*, p. 119) our deductions and teaching from the Scriptures may tend to an increased love for and study of the Bible ; and that they be measured by the standard of truth, accepting only of that which stands the test. Our argument exalts Jesus "the Christ," in that it brings Him forth distinctively as *the covenanted Messiah*, who is yet to fulfil the covenanted mercies promised to the fathers, and who is yet to reveal Himself as the Redeemer of the world in the inauguration of a government such as is *pre-eminently adapted* to the wants of a burdened creation. It honors the past, present, and future work of the Lord Jesus, and enters heartily into the consideration of the things pertaining to His glory, with the joyful hope of seeing and participating in the same ; it reverences the oath-bound covenants, the prophetic utterances, the faith of the ancients, with the pleasing anticipation of realizing in happy experience the blessed things promised, predicted, and believed. The Kingdom embraces all our desire—the King, the Princes, the Angels, the restored Jews, the admiring Gentiles, the released Creation, the Millennial gladness, the Eternal Ages, and God over all, blessed forevermore. Dr. Bonar (*Prophet. Landmarks*) has so happily expressed our thoughts that we reproduce his remarks as a fitting conclusion : "Our doctrine, as Millenarians, pervades the whole Word of God, from Genesis to Revelation. It is not confined to the figurative and poetical books. It declares itself with equal fulness in narrative and epistle, in symbol and in type. Like a thread of gold it runs through the whole web of Revelation, crossing and recrossing it everywhere, and imparting the richest brilliance in the whole texture. It is the burden of all prophecy. It is the summing up as well as the unravelling of all history. It is the final and grand solution of the mystery of God's dealings with this world of ours. It is the germ of Israel's types. It is woven into all their ordinances, and rites, and festivals. It is the theme of many a Psalm, the heart of many

a symbol, the subject of many a parable, the end and point of many a promise, the seal set to the Gospel of the grace of God as the '*Gospel of the Kingdom.*' It has been the hope of the Church through many a starless night, when other hopes had gone out one by one, like beacons shattered by the tempest, leaving her disconsolate and helpless. And it is now again, in our day, pressed upon her notice, as her strength in 'the hour of temptation, which is coming upon all the world,' the only light which cannot be quenched, and by which alone she will be able to steer her perilous course through the gloom of the thickening storm. It is no dream of carnal enthusiasts, enamored of materialism, and anticipating a paradise of gross delights. It is the calm belief of spiritual men, resting upon God's sure promise, and looking forward to a Kingdom of 'righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.' It is no hasty conjecture, no novelty of a feverish period, rashly caught up, without consideration and without evidence. It can produce the testimony of ages in its behalf; and they who have held it in our day have been men who studied their Bible on their knees, and have come to their conclusions after long, deliberate, and most solemn investigation. It is no fable of romance; it is sober, Scriptural reality, though far beyond what fancy ever painted. It is no vision of the politician, yet it shows us how, erelong, shall be exemplified that which earthly governments have been vainly striving to realize—*a peaceful and prosperous world.*" Whatever of defect or misconception may be in the preceding Propositions, yet the grand outlines, the precious doctrine of the Kingdom is undoubtedly true, because based on the plain grammatical sense of that which "*is written,*" "*the word of the Lord.*" It is no little gratification, advantage, and privilege to live at this period of time, way down in the feet of Nebuchadnezzar's image, with so many centuries of fulfilled prophecy, past and present, and a solemn and joyful culmination of the remainder imminently before us. The gratification arises from our lengthened view confirming the predictions of the future; the advantage springs from the practical use that we can make of the same, thrilling the heart with hope and joy at the glorious prospects; the privilege is seen in that we still live in a period enabling us to secure the inestimable blessing of "Kingship and priesthood." Contemplating the wonderful scheme of redemption and the results of the Christship, culminating in this Theocratic ordering, the heart—realizing "the earnest" preparative—is filled with peace in believing; "*the Gospel of the Kingdom*" imparting strength and weaning us from the world; the Theocratic King and His glory giving us more ravishing ideas of our own heirship and "high calling" while still "pilgrims and strangers;" appropriating faith beholding Jesus on the cross and the throne makes Him exceedingly precious, and delights itself in the things pertaining to the love, dominion, and excellent glory of One so dear and worthy. The Theocratic promises now make us content to await the time when God's ways will be vindicated, when His providences will be light, and when our own trials and sufferings will be seen as prerequisites to qualify us for our respective stations in the Kingdom. To those who object to such a vision of the future, to such views of a delightful land of promise, restored Eden, exalted, glorified, and Adamic condition, the Christ's Theocratic grandeur, etc., we only say in reply: "*This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes*" (Ps. 118 : 23). "*If it be marvellous in the eyes of the remnant of this people in these days, should it also be marvellous in mine eyes? saith the Lord of Hosts.*"

It is proper to acknowledge at the close of our labor gratitude to God that He has brought believers to the knowledge of such truth, and that once "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise" we "are made nigh by the blood of Christ;" and being "Christ's, then are Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise." We thank God that He has enabled us to lay hold upon His oath-attested covenants, and by faith in a covenanted Christ to have confidence and assurance in the fulfilment of His most gracious Word, so that when brethren forsook and reproached us (a sad trial, to which the Saviour was no exception) we still had great comfort. We thank Him that, unlike some (Erasmus-like) who keep silence, He put it into our heart to present His own rich treasures to others, as a token of gratitude, as a kind of testimony to the Church and the world, as a source of encouragement in the coming trial, although advised to sacrifice the best years of our life by committing this work to the flames, on the ground of the Church's hostility to its expressed faith. We thank Him that when often sorely tempted, tried, discouraged—when through poverty much of this work was written on leaves of books, old letters, and waste paper (so that Jonathan Edwards's straits could be appreciated, when reduced to write his *Freedom of the Will* on backs of letters and blank pages of pamphlets)—when depressed at the prevailing unbelief and the few in number with whom we could "take sweet counsel"—when falsely accused of heresy, fanaticism, and held up to odium, and influence sought to be lessened on account of Chiliasm, He was ever the prayer-hearing and answering God, supplying our wants, giving strengthening views of the unity of Divine Purpose, and the fulness of Jesus in redemption; imparting hope that as the work was designed to promote the Father's honor, the Son's glory, and the Spirit's praise, He would provide for its publication; and allowing the sweet privilege of being among that number who entertain, confess, and proclaim

"*The Blessed Hope,*"

even

"*His Appearing and Kingdom.*"

FINIS.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE.

The numbers I. II. III. denote the volumes, and the figures refer to the pages indicated.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

GENESIS.

Ch. 1 : 26, **II.** 581, **III.** 16.
" 1 : 28, **II.** 142, **III.** 16.
" 2 : 4, **II.** 365.
" 3 : 15, **II.** 181, 489, etc.
" 3 : 16, **II.** 146, 133.
" 3 : 18, 19, **II.** 143.
" 6 : 7, 13, 17, **II.** 511.
" 8 : 21, 22, **II.** 437.
" 9 : 12–16, **II.** 550.
" 9 : 25–27, **III.** 406.
" 9 : 27, **II.** 776
" 12 : 1–3, 7, **I.** 293, **III.** 601.
" 12 : 6, **II.** 771.
" 13 : 14–17, **I.** 293, **II.** 550.
" 15 : 4–21, **I.** 293.
" 15 : 5, **I.** 303, **II.** 133.
" 15 : 13–21, **II.** 144, 146.
" 15 : 18, **I.** 297.
" 17 : 4–16, **I.** 293, 295.
" 17 : 5–8, **II.** 550.
" 17 : 6, **II.** 576, **III.** 590.
" 17 : 7, 8, **I.** 303, **III.** 590.
" 18 : 18, **III.** 601.
" 18 : 19, **I.** 92.
" 19 : 14, **III.** 165.
" 19 : 15, 19, **II.** 619.
" 22 : 11, **II.** 619.
" 22 : 15–18, **I.** 293, **II.** 95.
" 22 : 16–26, **I.** 300, **II.** 133.
" 24 : 40, **II.** 619.
" 25 : 31–34, **II.** 269, 609.
" 26 : 3, **I.** 300.
" 26 : 4, **II.** 133.
" 26 : 24, **III.** 590.
" 27 : 29, **II.** 269, 315.
" 28 : 1–4, **I.** 294.
" 28 : 12, **II.** 619.
" 28 : 13, **III.** 590.
" 28 : 14, **II.** 133, **III.** 601.
" 32 : 12, **II.** 133.
" 32 : 28, **II.** 96.
Ch. 35 : 11, **II.** 576.
" 41 : 40, **III.** 55.
" 49 : 1, **I.** 446, **II.** 423.
" 49 : 3, **II.** 609.
" 49 : 9, **III.** 402.
" 49 : 10, **II.** 511, **III.** 398.
" 49 : 24, **I.** 676.
" 50 : 20, **III.** 430.

EXODUS.

Ch. 3 : 15, **I.** 296.
" 3 : 20, **I.** 92.
" 4 : 22, **II.** 609.
" 6 : 4, **I.** 297.
" 6 : 6, 7, **I.** 92, **III.** 590.
" 7 : 5, **I.** 92.
" 9 : 6, **II.** 379.
" 10 : 2, **I.** 92.
" 10 : 21–23, **III.** 164.
" 12 : 48, **I.** 230.
" 13 : 12, **II.** 609.
" 14 : 13–24, **II.** 759, 761.
" 14 : 14, **II.** 105.
" 15 : 1, **I.** 92.
" 15 : 3, **I.** 402.
" 15 : 11, **I.** 92.
" 15 : 17, **II.** 115, 200, 202, **III.** 38, 458.
" 18 : 46, **II.** 354.
" 19 : 3–10, **III.** 592.
" 19 : 4, **II.** 320.
" 19 : 5–8, **I.** 207, 401, **II.** 77, 95, 140, 608, **III.** 590.
" 22 : 29, **II.** 609.
" 23 : 31, **I.** 297, **II.** 144, 146.
" 23 : 33, **II.** 771.
" 24 : 3–8, **III.** 592.
" 24 : 5, **II.** 609.
" 29 : 45, **III.** 590.
" 34 : 12, **II.** 771.
" 34 : 19, 20, **II.** 609.
" 40 : 34, 35, **II.** 568.

LEVITICUS.

Ch. 5 : 42, **I.** 178.
" 8 : 2–5, **II.** 609.
" 10 : 11, **II.** 609.
" 13 : 6, 13, **II.** 62.
" 16 : 20, **III.** 459.
" 17 : 7, **I.** 224.
" 18 : 25, **II.** 772.
" 25 : 23, **I.** 302, **II.** 202.
" 26, **II.** 202, 774, **III.** 99.
" 26 : 7, 8, **II.** 115.
" 26 : 16, **II.** 146.
" 26 : 42–45, **I.** 178, 220, 225, 288, **II.** 53, 56, 82.
" 27 : 12, **III.** 590.

NUMBERS.

Ch. 3 : 12, 13, 40, 51, **I.** 609.
" 3 : 13, **II.** 269, 315.
" 8 : 5–20, **I.** 609.
" 9 : 14, **I.** 230.
" 11 : 25, 26, **III.** 70.
" 11 : 26, **I.** 669.
" 11 : 29, **III.** 71.
" 14 : 20, 28, **I.** 177.
" 14 : 21, **III.** 33, 210.
" 18 : 15, **I.** 609.
" 18 : 20, **III.** 51.
" 19 : 20, **III.** 70.
" 23, **III.** 401.
" 23 : 9, **II.** 56.
" 23 : 11, **I.** 768.
" 23 : 19, **I.** 177.
" 24, **III.** 402, etc.
" 24 : 2, **III.** 70.
" 24 : 17, 18, **I.** 310, **III.** 23.
" 31 : 8, **II.** 266.
" 31 : 49, **II.** 115.

DEUTERONOMY.

Ch. 1 : 8, **II.** 261.
" 1 : 36, **II.** 446.
" 3 : 24, **I.** 92.
" 4 : 10–20, **II.** 22.
" 4 : 12, **I.** 216.
" 4 : 20, **II.** 200.
" 4 : 24, **III.** 81.
" 4 : 27, 28, **II.** 65.
" 4 : 32–40, **I.** 92, 231.
" 6 : 20–25, **III.** 592.
" 7 : 6, **I.** 213, **II.** 40.
" 9 : 26, 29, **I.** 378, **II.** 200.
" 10 : 5, **I.** 401.
" 10 : 9, **III.** 51.
" 11 : 21, 22, **I.** 297.
" 11 : 24, **II.** 146.
" 11 : 41, **II.** 203, 144.
" 12 : 20, 21, **I.** 224.
" 12 : 32, **I.** 216.
" 13 : 1–3, **II.** 740, **III.** 258.
Ch. 14 : 2, **I.** 207, **II.** 140.
" 15 : 1, **III.** 99.
" 16 : 16, **I.** 216.
" 16 : 18, **I.** 216, 219.
" 17 : 8–13, **I.** 216, **II.** 609, 610.
" 17 : 14–20, **I.** 227.
" 18 : 1, 2, **III.** 51.
" 18 : 9–22, **III.** 599.
" 18 : 11, **III.** 145.
" 18 : 13–19, **II.** 195, **III.** 426.
" 18 : 18, 19, **II.** 76.
" 18 : 21, 22, **I.** 178.
" 20 : 16, 17, **II.** 771.
" 21 : 5, **II.** 610.
" 21 : 17, **II.** 269, 315, 609.
" 22 : 29, **I.** 142.
" 24, **III.** 592.
" 25 : 13, **I.** 683.
" 26 : 18, **II.** 140.
" 28, **I.** 220, **II.** 447.
" 28 : 36, 62–64, **II.** 65.
" 29 : 10–13, **I.** 216, **III.** 592.
" 29 : 29, **III.** 151.
" 30 : 3, 4, **II.** 66.
" 30 : 20, **I.** 224.
" 30–33, **I.** 225.
" 31 : 16, **II.** 261.
" 32, **I.** 164, 378, 408, 417, **II.** 202, 274.
" 32 : 1–13, **I.** 209, **II.** 320.
" 32 : 8–15, **I.** 224, **II.** 598.
" 32 : 21–43, **I.** 232, 393, 417, **II.** 56, 59, 68, 76, 183, **III.** 185, 393, 414.
" 32 : 22, **II.** 508, 513, 519.
" 32 : 30, **II.** 115.
" 32 : 36, **II.** 95.
" 32 : 39, **I.** 297, **II.** 254, **III.** 393.
" 33 : 1, 2, **III.** 20.
" 33 : 9, 10, **II.** 609.
" 33 : 12, **II.** 366.
" 33 : 21, **I.** 316, **II.** 72.
" 33 : 27, **II.** 115.
" 33 : 29, **II.** 114.
" 34 : 2, **II.** 669.

JOSHUA.

Ch. 1 : 3, 4, **II.** 146.
" 8 : 30–35, **III.** 592.
" 10 : 11, 12, **III.** 395.
" 10 : 28, **II.** 293.
" 11 : 11, **II.** 266.
" 13 : 33, **III.** 51.
" 14 : 9, **II.** 446.
" 24 : 31, **III.** 99.

JUDGES.

Ch. 2 : 1–5, **II.** 771.
" 2 : 16–19, **II.** 354.
" 5 : 4, 5, **III.** 21.
" 5 : 13, 31, **II.** 578.
" 8 : 22, 23, **I.** 226.
" 15 : 20, **III.** 99.
" 16 : 31, **III.** 99.

I. SAMUEL.

Ch. 2, II. 24.
" 2 : 1-10, II. 111, 254, 230, 273, 582, III. 572.
" 4 : 1, III. 99.
" 6 : 20, I. 228.
" 7 : 10, III. 406.
" 7 : 13, III. 99.
" 7 : 23, 26, I. 228.
" 8 : 4–9, I. 226.
" 8 : 5, 6, 20, II. 354.
" 8 : 7, I. 217.
" 8 : 11, II. 229, 233.
" 8 : 17, II. 36.
" 8 : 19–23, II. 154, 178, 236.
" 8 : 23, II. 240, 241, 259.
" 8 : 30, II. 240.
" 9 : 15–27, I. 236.
" 10 : 1–26, I. 236.
" 10 : 10, III. 70.
" 10 : 11, II. 200.
" 10 : 17–19, I. 226.
" 10 : 23, I. 236.
" 11 : 14, II. 499.
" 12 : 2, III. 99.
" 12 : 12, I. 217, 226.
" 12 : 16–19, I. 226.
" 12 : 17, 18, III. 406.
" 13 : 12, I. 228.
" 13 : 14, I. 236.
" 15 : 29, I. 177, 179.
" 22 : 14, III. 406.
" 23 : 1, III. 571.
" 24 : 6, I. 234, III. 571.
" 25 : 29, III. 341.
" 26 : 19, II. 200.
" 28 : 15, I. 228.

II. SAMUEL.

Ch. 7 : 1, III. 55.
" 7 : 4–17, I. 177, 215, 313, 342, 353.
" 7 : 16, II. 631.
" 7 : 19, I. 314, 581.
" 7 : 23, 24, I. 315, 400, II. 114.
" 15 : 4, II. 355.
" 21 : 3, II. 200.
" 22 : 35–47, II. 114.
" 23 : 1–4, II. 415.
" 23 : 5, I. 316.
" 23 : 7, II. 462.
" 24, I. 235.

I. KINGS.

Ch. 3 : 8–13, I. 119, 228.
" 6 : 1, III. 99.
" 6 : 12, 14, I. 228.
" 6 : 16, I. 449.
" 8, I. 228.
" 8 : 51, 53, II. 200.
" 11 : 36, II. 96.
Ch. 11 : 39, I. 422.
" 13 : 3, 4, III. 400.

II. KINGS.

Ch. 2 : 11, II. 487.
" 6 : 17, II. 487.
" 8 : 19, II. 96.
" 15 : 4, II. 96.
" 18 : 21, III. 389.
" 21 : 14, II. 200.

I. CHRONICLES.

Ch. 14 : 17, II. 379.
" 16 : 14–19, II. 355.
" 16 : 30, II. 436.
" 17 : 11–27, I. 313, II. 55.
" 17 : 16, I. 314, 342, 581.
" 17 : 21, 22, I. 315, II. 56.
" 21, I. 235.
" 27, II. 114.
" 28 : 5, I. 234.
" 29 : 15, I. 301, 310.

II. CHRONICLES.

Ch. 6 : 14–16, I. 343, II. 81.
" 6 : 18, III. 445.
" 7 : 12–22, I. 378, II. 169, 318.
" 9 : 8, I. 228, 234.
" 13 : 8, I. 234.
" 15 : 8, II. 499.
" 20 : 7, I. 335.
" 21 : 3, II. 609.
" 24 : 2, II. 499.
" 36 : 21, III. 182.

EZRA.

Ch. 1 : 5, II. 89.
" 4 : 13, I. 237.
" 6 : 17–21, II. 89.
" 7 : 24, I. 237.

NEHEMIAH.

Ch. 4 : 5, III. 459.
" 9 : 36, 37, II. 537.

JOB.

Ch. 3 : 13, 17, II. 248.
" 3 : 18, II. 254.
" 7 : 21, II. 416.
" 10 : 17, II. 499.
" 10 : 21, 22, II. 256, III. 389.
" 19 : 25, II. 259,
" 21 : 30, II. 277, 278.
" 22 : 5–7, I. 536.
" 26 : 10, I. 34.
" 27 : 19, I. 274.
" 40 : 13, I. 274.

PSALMS.

Ps. 2, 17, 22, 69, I. 314, 615, II. 108, 186, 189, 191, 497, 742, 752, 761, 768, III. 416, 417.

Ch. 2 : 1, 2, III. 571, 575.
" 2 : 2, 5, 6, 8, I. 184, 266, 458, 577, 695, II. 105, 201, 278, 775, III. 571.
" 2 : 7, 8, II. 446, 581, III. 189, 478.
" 2 : 10–12, III. 577.
" 2 : 12, II. 72, 113.
" 3 : 5, II. 258, III. 389.
" 3 : 6, II. 259.
" 3 : 18, II. 257.
" 6 : 4, II. 266.
" 6 : 10, II. 276.
" 7, II. 356.
" 7 : 12, 13, III. 395.
" 8, II. 485, 487, 589, III. 16.
" 8 : 3, 4, III. 445.
" 8 : 5–8, I. 572, 574, 614, II. 142.
" 9, II. 699.
" 9 : 1–8, III. 215.
" 9 : 7, 8, II. 355.
" 9 : 13, 14, II. 260, III. 452.
" 9 : 15–20, II. 109.
" 10, II. 757.
" 10 : 15–18, II. 105, 699.
" 11 : 1, III. 24.
" 11 : 6, II. 519, III. 394.
" 12, II. 699.
" 14, II. 699.
" 14 : 7, II. 72, III. 452.
" 16 : 5, III. 51.
" 16 : 10, II. 237, 258, III. 389.
" 16 : 11, II. 592, 599.
" 17 : 7–9, II. 326.
" 17 : 15, II. 306.
" 18, II. 736.
" 18 : 13, III. 406.
" 19 : 15, II. 189.
" 21, I. 314, II. 714, 768.
" 21 : 7–13, III. 215.
" 21 : 11, II. 760.
" 22, I. 304.
" 22 : 6, III. 571.
" 22 : 16, III. 415.
" 22 : 27, 28, I. 479, 536, III. 215.
" 23, III. 388, etc.
" 23 : 5, II. 582.
" 25 : 14, I. 307, II. 186.
" 27, II. 254.
" 27 : 5, II. 325.
" 27 : 13, II. 499.
" 28 : 9, II. 200.
" 30, II. 204, 259, 260, 262.
" 30 : 5, II. 414.
" 31, II. 251, 275.
" 31 : 5, III. 393.
" 31 : 8, III. 393.
" 31 : 19, 20, II. 325.
" 32 : 6, 7, II. 323.
" 32 : 9, III. 16.
" 33 : 11, I. 288.
" 35 : 10, II. 251.
" 35 : 22, II. 111.
" 36 : 8, III. 57.
" 37, II. 274, 377, 434, 440, 752, III. 185.
Ch. 37 : 2–15, II. 713.
" 37 : 9–34, I. 305.
" 37 : 11, II. 446.
" 37 : 24, III. 393.
" 37 : 38–40, II. 323.
" 37 : 39, III. 452.
" 39 : 12, I. 301, 310.
" 39 : 13, II. 290.
" 40 : 8, II. 162.
" 41 : 8–10, II. 256.
" 42, III. 415.
" 42 : 5, III. 452.
" 43, III. 415.
" 44 : 19, III. 389.
" 45, I. 314, 616, II. 139, 325, 330, 550, III. 406.
" 45 : 6, 7, II. 114, 346, 582, 637, III. 390, 416, 518.
" 45 : 8, III. 571.
" 45 : 16, II. 588.
" 46, II. 114, 744, III. 24, 392.
" 46 : 4, I. 508.
" 46 : 4–6, II. 761.
" 46 : 5, II. 416.
" 46 : 6–11, II. 770.
" 47, II. 114, 580.
" 48, II. 114, III. 36, 392.
" 48 : 1, 2, I. 508, III. 56.
" 48 : 4, II. 753.
" 48 : 12, I. 305, 314.
" 49, II. 261, 275.
" 49 : 14, 15, II. 415, 417, III. 389.
" 49 : 20, III. 16.
" 50, II. 356, 737.
" 50 : 1–6, II. 177, 188, 242.
" 51, II. 699.
" 51 : 1, III. 459.
" 52, II. 256, 699, 713.
" 52 : 5, II. 273.
" 53, II. 721.
" 53 : 1, II. 723.
" 53 : 6, III. 452.
" 55, II. 69, 109, II. 111.
" 56, II. 256.
" 56 : 13, II. 275.
" 57 : 16, II. 259.
" 58 : 2, III. 57.
" 58 : 10, II. 109.
" 58 : 18, II. 743.
" 59, II. 276, 711, 753.
" 59 : 16, II. 416.
" 60, II. 114.
" 62 : 4, II. 760.
" 63 : 11, II. 180.
" 64, II. 739, 757.
" 64 : 2, II. 326.
" 65, II. 145.
" 65 : 4, III. 57.
" 65 : 7, II. 527.
" 66 : 1–4, II. 616.
" 67 : 4, II. 353, 370.
" 68 : II. 114, III. 19, etc., 392.
" 68 : 11, II. 610, III. 30.

Ch. 68 : 13, II. 593, 596.
" 68 : 16, I. 303.
" 68 : 17, III. 395.
" 68 : 22, II. 91.
" 68 : 23, II. 109.
" 68 : 30, III. 16.
" 69, I. 243, 303, II. 736.
" 69 : 22, 23, II. 69.
" 69 : 34, II. 514.
" 69 : 35, 36, II. 547.
" 71, II. 257.
" 72 : I. 304, 314, II. 437, 550, 713.
" 72 : 3, II. 580.
" 72 : 4, I. 536.
" 72 : 5, 7, 17, II. 143, III. 418, 479.
" 72 : 7–11, III. 191, 210, 418.
" 72 : 8, III. 404.
" 72 : 15, 17, III. 479.
" 73, II. 752.
" 74, III. 452.
" 74 : 2, III. 389.
" 74 : 12, III. 33.
" 74 : 14, III. 21.
" 75, II. 699.
" 75 : 10, II. 579.
" 76, II. 113, 768, III. 392.
" 76 : 2, I. 305.
" 76 : 3, II. 761.
" 76 : 9, II. 356, 441.
" 77 : 18, III. 406.
" 78 : 54, II. 202 III. 38, 458.
" 79, II. 255.
" 80, II. 76.
" 80 : 17, 18, I. 566, 570, II. 257.
" 81 : 8–18, I. 378, III. 544.
" 81 : 13, 16, I. 222.
" 82 : 8, II. 355.
" 83, II. 114, 760.
" 83 : 3, II. 326, III. 393.
" 83 : 4, I. 149.
" 83 : 12, II. 768.
" 84 : 10, II. 611, III. 57.
" 85 : 5–7, III. 393.
" 85 : 9, III. 452.
" 86, II. 256.
" 87 : 3, I. 508.
" 88 : 10–13, II. 275.
" 88 : 18, II. 256, 262.
" 89 : 132, I. 180, 237, 314, 318, II. 77. 137, 177, 250, 579, III. 417, 418.
" 89 : 3, 4. 33, I. 316, II. 368.
" 89 : 4, 29, 36, 37, II. 551, III. 389.
" 89 : 9, III. 394.
" 89 : 15–17, II. 593.
" 89 : 17–19, II. 93.
" 89 : 20–52, I. 247, II. 582, III. 390.
" 89 : 23–25, III. 396.
" 89 : 27, III. 403.
" 89 : 28, II. 609.
" 89 : 30–34, I. 177, 313.
" 89 : 34–36, I. 199, 287, 316, 343, II. 431.
" 89 : 38–45, I. 628.
" 89 : 39, III. 399.
Ch. 89 : 48, II. 266.
" 90, II. 260, 416.
" 90 : 4, II. 236, 366, 368, III. 92.
" 90 : 10, 13, II. 370.
" 90 : 41, I. 458.
" 91, II. 326.
" 92 : 7–9, II. 713, 752.
" 92 : 10, II. 582, III. 390.
" 93, III. 391.
" 93 : 1, II. 431.
" 93 : 2, III. 406.
" 93 : 3–5, II. 527, III. 395.
" 94, II. 356, 699, 740.
" 94 : 9, 10, I. 38, II. 579.
" 94 : 12, 13, II. 325.
" 94 : 14, II. 201.
" 94 : 15, II. 356, 580.
" 95 : 7, II. 441.
" 95 : 8, II. 365.
" 96, 97, 98, II. 356, III. 391.
" 96 : 5, II. 748.
" 96 : 10–13, II. 353, 355, 514.
" 97, III. 391–2.
" 97 : 3, II. 507.
" 97 : 7, II. 183, 748.
" 98, III. 28, 392.
" 98 : 2, III. 452.
" 98 : 5–9, II. 353, 370, 514.
" 99, III. 391.
" 99 : 15, II. 262, 270, 294.
" 100, III. 391.
" 101 : 1, II. 471.
" 101 : 8, II. 416, III. 36.
" 102, II. 177, 255, 260, 550.
" 102 : 14, III. 148.
" 102 : 16, II. 77.
" 102 : 18, II. 276.
" 102 : 25–27, II. 519.
" 103 : 5, II. 320, 499.
" 103 : 15, II. 260.
" 104 : 4, 5, I. 313, II. 431, 436, III. 418.
" 104 : 29, 30, II. 259, 262, 483.
" 104 : 35, III. 185.
" 107, III. 36.
" 107 : 42, II. 96.
" 109, II. 276, 736, III. 391.
" 110, I. 314, 577, II. 109, 114, 602, 714, 768, III. 417, 418.
" 110 : 2, 3, II. 415, 417, 580, III. 389.
" 110 : 3–6, III. 24, 185.
" 110 : 4, II. 145, 601.
" 111 : 1, II. 325.
" 111 : 2, I. 169.
" 111 : 9, II. 258.
" 112 : 9, 10, II. 594.
" 113, II. 553, 579, III. 392.
" 113 : 9, II. 134, III. 57.
" 115, II. 441, 761.
" 115 : 16, II. 437.
" 115 : 17, 18, II. 275.
" 116, II. 254, 441.
" 116 : 3–8, III. 389.
" 117, I. 365.

Ch. 118, II. 256, 278, 753.
" 118 : 6–18, III. 389.
" 118 : 14, III. 452.
" 118 : 22, 23, I. 676, III. 414.
" 118 : 24, II. 365.
" 118 : 26, II. 77, 162.
" 119 : 6, 9, II. 743.
" 119 : 12–18, I. 7.
" 119 : 19, I. 300.
" 119 : 105, I. 116.
" 120, II. 699.
" 122, II. 95, III. 55.
" 122 : 3, III. 50.
" 122 : 5, III. 33.
" 124, II. 61.
" 126, III. 24.
" 127 : 1, 2, III. 341.
" 128, II. 96.
" 130 : 5, 6, III. 310.
" 130 : 6, II. 417.
" 132, II. 201, III. 417.
" 132 : 11–18, I. 247, 303, 314, 316.
" 132 : 13, 14, II. 776, III. 49, 55.
" 132 : 16, II. 96, III. 452.
" 135, II. 140.
" 136, II. 109, 441.
" 136 : 4, II. 56.
" 137, II. 736.
" 138 : 4, 5, II. 579, 581, III. 30.
" 140, II. 274, 699, 713.
" 140 : 7, II. 115.
" 142, II. 254.
" 143 : 3, II. 256.
" 143 : 3–6, II. 431, 437.
" 143 : 8, II. 416.
" 143 : 11, II. 257.
" 144, II. 114.
" 145 : 13, II. 414, 550, 638, III. 16.
" 146, II. 274.
" 146 : 10, II. 550.
" 147, II. 274, III. 193.
" 147 : 2, III. 33.
" 147 : 7, II. 250.
" 147 : 20, I. 231.
" 148, II. 114.
" 148 : 2, II. 77.
" 148 : 14, II. 98.
" 149 : 4, III. 452.
" 149 : 5, II. 615.
" 149 : 5–9, I. 496, II. 104, 110, 318, 322, 385, 578, III. 28, 81, 396.
" 149 : 9, III. 394.

PROVERBS.

Ch. 1 : 24–32, II. 713.
" 2 : 21, 22, II. 441–2.
" 3 : 16, II. 599.
" 3 : 25, 26, II. 323.
" 4 : 8, 9, II. 581, 593.
" 6 : 30, II. 266.
" 8 : 14–16, II. 580.
" 8 : 18–21, II. 596.
" 8 : 31, I. 87.
Ch. 10 : 30, II. 441.
" 11 : 31, II. 441, 443.
" 12 : 7, II. 441.
" 12 : 23, III. 17.
" 13 : 16, III. 17.
" 13 : 22, II. 143.
" 14 : 11, 19, II. 581.
" 15 : 2, III. 17.
" 15 : 25, II. 138.
" 16 : 11, I. 683.
" 18 : 12, II. 713.
" 19 : 21, II. 713.
" 20 : 20, II. 277.
" 21 : 16, II. 273.
" 22 : 4, II. 596.
" 25 : 2, II. 334.

ECCLESIASTES.

Ch. 1 : 4, II. 431.
" 4 : 13, 14, II. 594.
" 6 : 4, II. 256.
" 10 : 1, II. 102.

ISAIAH.

Ch. 1 : 1–26, III. 33, 36.
" 1 : 4, 5, III. 391.
" 1 : 9, 10, II. 68, 290.
" 1 : 26, 27, I. 664, II. 61, 142, 471, 586, III. 81.
" 2, II. 748, III. 30, 372.
" 2 : 1–5, I. 193, 446, 685, II. 99, 120, 141, 195, 338, 423, 471, III. 55, 190, 338.
" 2 : 3, II. 610, III. 33, 89.
" 2 : 4, III. 596.
" 2 : 10–22, II. 519, 768, III. 395.
" 2 : 12, II. 368.
" 2 : 18–20, III. 189.
" 2 : 19, 21, II. 374, 495,
" 3 : 9, II. 290.
" 4 : 2, 6, II. 89, III. 33, 553.
" 4 : 5, II. 146.
" 5 : 26–30, II. 766, III. 394.
" 6 : 1–10, III. 538.
" 6 : 3–5, I. 688.
" 6 : 9–13, I. 215, 615.
" 7 : 13, 14, III. 542.
" 8 : 7, 8, III. 394.
" 8 : 8, I. 303.
" 8 : 9, II. 416.
" 8 : 14, II. 91.
" 8 : 20, I. 116, 126, 205.
" 9 : 1, III. 24.
" 9 : 4, 5, II. 768–9, III. 389.
" 9 : 6, 7, I. 315, 342, 415, 614–16, 627, II. 77, 177, 355, 426, 550, 638, III. 310, 416, 418, 478.
" 10 : 13, II. 699.
" 10 : 15, III. 342.
" 10 : 17, III. 81.
" 10 : 19–21, II. 574.
" 10 : 22, 23, II. 67.
" 10 : 26–34, II. 761.

Ch. 11 : 1–16, II. 61–2, 65, 91, 219, 471, 669, 699, 714.
" 11 : 6, 8, II. 484, 486.
" 11 : 9, I. 696, II. 142, 143, III. 30, 183, 190, 210.
" 11 : 6–10, I. 205, 233, II. 58, 143–4, 454.
" 11 : 13, II. 335, 594.
" 12 : 2, 3, II. 142, III. 453.
" 12 : 6, II. 138.
" 13, II. 714, 753, III. 24.
" 13 : 9–14, II. 519.
" 13 : 13, II. 492, 495, 497.
" 14, II. 714.
" 14 : 1, 2, I. 62.
" 14 : 2–15, II. 497, 502.
" 14 : 4, 5, III. 389.
" 14 : 9, III. 557.
" 14 : 24–27, I. 179, II. 105, III. 340.
" 14 : 25, II. 699.
" 16 : 1–5, III. 24, 26.
" 16 : 3, 5, II. 77, 326, 355.
" 16 : 5, III. 534.
" 17, II. 748.
" 17 : 12–14, II. 753, 765.
" 17 : 14, II. 416.
" 19 : 20, II. 144.
" 19 : 24, II. 94.
" 20 : 11, II. 502.
" 21 : 11, II. 414.
" 22 : 2, I. 193.
" 23 : 4, II. 580.
" 23 : 18, II. 143.
" 23 : 21, III. 388.
" 24, II. 742, 737, 768.
" 24 : 4–7, II. 492.
" 24 : 5, II. 365.
" 24 : 6, 13, II. 547, 549.
" 24 : 9, III. 396.
" 24 : 19, 20, II. 513, 519, 686.
" 24 : 21, III. 372.
" 24 : 22, I. 684.
" 24 : 23, I. 245, 427, II. 142, 590, III. 32, 395.
" 24 : 25, 26, II. 274, etc., 104.
" 25, II. 142, 145, 187, 463, 714, 737, 768.
" 25 : 6, 7, III. 57, 390.
" 25 : 6–10, I. 684, II. 244, 247, 260, 327, III. 190.
" 25 : 7, II. 142.
" 25 : 8, I. 33, 246, 248, II. 187, 543.
" 25 : 9, II. 142, 306, III. 160, 310, 416, 418, 449, 452.
" 25 : 29–33, II. 108.
" 26, II. 714.
" 26 : 1, 2, I. 648, II. 142, III. 36.
" 26 : 5–19, 20, 21, I. 684, II. 104, 260, 263, 416, 418.
" 26 : 6, II. 440, 449.
" 26 : 9, II. 543, 768, III. 185.
" 26 : 19, II. 250–1.
" 26 : 20, 21, II. 179, 247, 277, 325, III. 24.
" 27 : 1, III. 16.
Ch. 27 : 6, II. 136, III. 191.
" 27 : 12, II. 144.
" 27 : 13, II. 453.
" 28 : 12, II. 462.
" 28 : 21, I. 81.
" 28 : 22, II. 68, 741.
" 28 : 27, II. 662.
" 29, II. 768.
" 29 : 6, III. 406.
" 29 : 8, II. 266.
" 29 : 10, II. 69.
" 29 : 11–14, I. 81, 165.
" 29 : 17, I. 143.
" 29 : 19, 20, II. 735.
" 29 : 22, 23, II. 225.
" 30 : 4–19, I. 336, II. 73, 84, 356.
" 30 : 17, II. 107.
" 30 : 26, II. 64, 419.
" 31 : 10–36, I. 336.
" 32 : 1, II. 112, 142, 580.
" 32 : 3–5, II. 143, 145.
" 32 : 15, 16, II. 79, III. 21, 67.
" 32 : 20, II. 486.
" 33, I. 143, II. 737.
" 33 : 9, II. 492.
" 33 : 16–22, III. 453.
" 33 : 17, II. 553.
" 33 : 20, 21, II. 99, III. 534.
" 33 : 24, II. 143.
" 34, II. 483, 761–2, 769, III. 24.
" 34 : 4, 5, II. 446, 492, 497.
" 34 : 17, II. 550.
" 35, I. 143, II. 462, 469, III. 24.
" 35 : 1–9, II. 143, 662, III. 389.
" 35 : 2, II. 374.
" 35 : 4, II. 142, 752.
" 35 : 10, II. 235, 258, 592, 616, 672, III. 390.
" 35 : 16, III. 21.
" 35 : 44, III. 396.
" 38 : 17, II. 392.
" 40 : 3, III. 22–3, 27, 532.
" 40 : 4, 5, III. 339.
" 40 : 5, II. 374.
" 40 : 6, 7, 8, II. 259.
" 40 : 10, 11, II. 183, III. 338–9.
" 40 : 14, I. 38.
" 40 : 31, II. 169, 320.
" 41, II. 737, 769, III. 27, 406.
" 41 : 15, 16, I. 10, 12, II. 108, 662–3, III. 57.
" 41 : 17, II. 462.
" 41 : 18, III. 389.
" 41 : 19, 20, III. 21.
" 42, I. 64, II. 275.
" 42 : 4, II. 356.
" 42 : 6, I. 328.
" 42 : 7, II. 254.
" 42 : 11, III. 24.
" 42 : 13, II. 753, 759.
" 42 : 18–20, III. 327.
" 42 : 22, II. 254.
" 43, I. 64.

Ch. 43 : 1–7, II. 66, 114.
" 43 : 2, III. 389.
" 43 : 9, 13, I. 169, II. 66.
" 43 : 17, II. 276.
" 43 : 18–21, III. 22, 342.
" 43 : 19, 20, II. 462, 662.
" 43 : 21, II. 577.
" 43 : 25, II. 84, III. 459.
" 44, II. 747.
" 44 : 3, III. 67.
" 44 : 4, II. 548.
" 44 : 8, II. 66.
" 44 : 22–26, II. 84, 79, III. 204, 459.
" 45 : 16, 17, II. 747, III. 453.
" 45 : 18, II. 436, III. 443.
" 45 : 20, II. 547, III. 532.
" 45 : 21, II. 612.
" 45 : 23, II. 180, 300, III. 196.
" 46, II. 747.
" 46 : 9, 10, I. 35, 38, 179.
" 48 : 3–6, I. 179.
" 48 : 18, I. 378.
" 49, I. 577, II. 49, 99, 132, 737.
" 49 : 1–23, I. 629, II. 65, 76.
" 49 : 2, II. 194, 203, III. 394.
" 49 : 3, I. 400.
" 49 : 3–8, II. 77–8, 136, 207, 328, 436, 587.
" 49 : 8–11, III. 453.
" 49 : 9, II. 254.
" 49 : 12, II. 112.
" 49 : 13–17, II. 80, 132, 136, 138.
" 49 : 18, II. 225.
" 49 : 18–23, I. 615, 688, II. 94, 133, 142–3.
" 49 : 22, III. 192.
" 49 : 24, II. 254, 768, 772.
" 49 : 26, II. 142, 768, 772.
" 50 : 1, I. 133.
" 51, II. 143.
" 51 : 1–3, I. 293, 328, 427, II. 68, 143–4.
" 51 : 8, II. 535, 550.
" 51 : 9, III. 16.
" 51 : 11, II. 258, III. 390.
" 51 : 12, II. 713.
" 51 : 16, II. 12, 436, 446, 497.
" 51 : 17–23, II. 61.
" 51 : 42, III. 394.
" 52, II. 64.
" 52 : 1, II. 112, 142.
" 52 : 1–10, II. 96, 143.
" 52 : 8, III. 339.
" 52 : 9, 10, III. 33.
" 53, I. 243, II. 169, III. 425.
" 53 : 8, II. 256.
" 54, II. 145, 187, 441, III. 190, 548.
" 54 : 1–17, II. 130, 259.
" 54 : 5, III. 534.
" 54 : 7, II. 460.
" 54 : 9, 10, I. 245, 287.
" 54 : 11, 12, III. 45.
" 54 : 12, II. 143.
" 54 : 13, II. 142, 304, III. 30, 183.
" 54 : 15, II. 527, 753.
Ch. 55, I. 223, 378.
" 55 : 3, III. 572.
" 55 : 4, III. 571.
" 56 : 5, III. 57.
" 56 : 8, II. 76.
" 57 : 2, II. 249.
" 57 : 13, II. 441.
" 58, I. 222.
" 58 : 8, II. 417.
" 58 : 12–14, II. 471.
" 59 : 16–20, III. 24, 453.
" 59 : 19, III. 191.
" 59 : 19–21, II. 79, 734.
" 59 : 21, III. 67.
" 60, I. 246, II. 94, 99, 114, 134, 143, 145, 152, 187, 233, 370, 441, 548, III. 190, 218, 236, 238, 548.
" 60 : 1, II. 77.
" 60 : 1, 2, 19, II. 374.
" 60 : 1–22, III. 89, 453.
" 60 : 4, II. 225.
" 60 : 5–17, II. 143.
" 60 : 6–10, I. 496, II. 596.
" 60 : 7, III. 57.
" 60 : 11, 12, III. 210.
" 60 : 12, II. 94, 499, 527, III. 596.
" 60 : 14–20, III. 33, 45.
" 60 : 15, I. 428, II. 538.
" 60 : 17, II. 142, 580.
" 60 : 19, 20, II. 419, 528.
" 60 : 21, II. 142, 261, 435, III. 393.
" 61, II. 64, 134, 143, III. 548.
" 61 : 1, II. 254.
" 61 : 3, III. 21.
" 61 : 4–11, II. 499, 548.
" 61 : 6, II. 608, III. 89.
" 61 : 9, II. 93.
" 61 : 10, III. 453.
" 62, I. 233, II. 134, 143, 417, III. 42.
" 62 : 1, 2, II. 77, 80, 93, 374, III. 81, 453.
" 62 : 1–5, II. 584, III. 33.
" 62 : 3, III. 50, 394.
" 62 : 4, I. 428, II. 202.
" 62 : 5, II. 203.
" 62 : 6, 7, III. 36.
" 62 : 10, III. 192.
" 62 : 11, 12, II. 662.
" 63, I. 180, II. 104, 109, 194, 771.
" 63 : 1–6, I. 683, 686, II. 767–8, III. 246, 249, 396.
" 63 : 3, II. 104, 743.
" 63 : 4, II. 145, 453.
" 63 : 5, III. 453.
" 63 : 15, 16, III. 393.
" 63 : 17, 18, I. 306, II. 76, 200–1.
" 64 : 1, 2, III. 393.
" 64 : 4, II. 165.
" 64 : 5, II. 422.
" 65, II. 152, 370.
" 65, 66, II. 499, etc., 502, etc., 506, etc., 513–14, 524, etc., 547, 549, 576.
" 65 : 9, II. 201, 226.

Ch. 65 : 11–17, II. 747, 749.
" 65 : 17, I. 248, 480, 686, II. 143, 471, 543, 547.
" 65 : 17, 18, III. 44, 56.
" 65 : 17–25, II. 74, 96, 486, III. 255.
" 65 : 18, II. 146, 526.
" 65 : 19, III. 33.
" 65 : 20, 22, II. 548, III. 598.
" 65 : 23, II. 143, 147, 178, 180, 236.
" 66, II. 152.
" 66 : 5, I. 552, III. 327.
" 66 : 5–24, II. 714.
" 66 : 7–9, II. 257.
" 66 : 8–10, II. 476,
" 66 : 12, I. 615, 688, II. 94.
" 66 : 12–16, II. 177, 253.
" 66 : 14, III. 394.
" 66 : 15–24, II. 374, 377, III. 186, 190, 400.
" 67 : 17, II. 747.
" 66 : 19, 20, II. 75, 87, 375, 768, 779.
" 66 : 21, III. 89.
" 66 : 22, I. 248, II. 87, 143, 178, 446, 507, 526.
" 66 : 23, III. 596.

JEREMIAH.

Ch. 2 : 3, III. 24.
" 2 : 34, II. 266.
" 3 : 1–22, II. 133.
" 3 : 14, III. 40.
" 3 : 17–19, I. 244, 427, II. 63, 114, 569, III. 32, 56.
" 3 : 20, II. 131.
" 4 : 23–25, II. 497, 519.
" 6 : 14, III. 203.
" 10, II. 747.
" 10 : 16, III. 389.
" 10 : 23, III. 341.
" 12 : 4, II. 492.
" 13 : 1–7, I. 193.
" 14 : 8, III. 309.
" 14 : 13, 14, III. 203.
" 15 : 8, II. 146.
" 16 : 2, I. 193.
" 16 : 13, II. 65.
" 17, 7, 13, III. 309.
" 17 : 25, I. 222, 343, III. 86.
" 18 : 2–6, III. 340.
" 18 : 7–10, I. 177.
" 18 : 23, III. 459.
" 20 : 10, III. 238.
" 22 : 4, 5, I. 343, 628.
" 22 : 30, II. 127.
" 23 : 4, III. 388.
" 23 : 5–8, I. 184, 266, 315, 458, II. 63, 84, 142, 355–6, 471, III. 310, 424, 478.
" 23 : 6, II. 89.
" 23 : 14, II. 290.
" 23 : 16, 17, III. 203.
" 24 : 6, 7, II. 471.
" 24 : 14, III. 99.
" 25 : 29–33, II. 108, 753, 779.
Ch. 30 : 4–24, II. 56, 61, 107.
" 30 : 6–9, II. 655.
" 30 : 7, II. 142.
" 30 : 9, I. 315, III. 572.
" 30 : 18–20, II. 143, III. 89.
" 30 : 21, II. 142.
" 31, II. 64.
" 31 : 2, 3, II. 79, III. 21.
" 31 : 5, 6, II. 143.
" 31 : 11, II. 259.
" 31 : 15–17, II. 253, 597.
" 31 : 22, II. 108.
" 31 : 27, II. 136.
" 31 : 31, etc., I. 245, 322, 335, II. 80, 84.
" 31 : 33, III. 40.
" 31 : 34, III. 183.
" 31 : 35, 36–40, I. 245, 287, II. 49, 56–7, 63, 66, 142–3, 431.
" 31 : 38–40, III. 50.
" 32 : 37–44, II. 57, 63, 84.
" 32 : 39, 40, II. 550.
" 33, 36, I. 234, II. 177.
" 33 : 7–16, II. 84, 114, 143, 550.
" 33 : 9, II. 768.
" 33 : 14, I. 240, 343, 347.
" 33 : 15, II. 355.
" 33 : 18–21, III. 89.
" 33 : 19–26, I. 245, 287, 315, 343, II. 49, 63, 136, 431, 580.
" 33 : 22, II. 551.
" 46 : 7, 8, III, 394.
" 46 : 28, II. 56, 65.
" 47 : 2, III. 394.
" 48 : 10, II. 114.
" 48 : 17, 29, III. 389.
" 48 : 25, II. 579.
" 50 : 4, II. 143.
" 50 : 5, III. 64.
" 51 : 19, 20, II. 108, 114.

LAMENTATIONS.

Ch. 2 : 1, II. 502.
" 2 : 15, III. 33.
" 3 : 18, II. 251.
" 3 : 34, II. 254.
" 4 : 20, III. 571.

EZEKIEL.

Ch. 3 : 19, 21, III. 203.
" 5 : 5, III. 33.
" 7 : 12, III. 70.
" 9 : 23–33, III. 406.
" 11 : 15, II. 64.
" 11 : 16–20, II. 56–7, 63.
" 11 : 19, II. 143, III. 73.
" 11 : 20, III. 590.
" 12 : 15, II. 65.
" 12 : 22, III. 327.
" 13 : 2, 6–16, III. 327.
" 13 : 9, II. 249.
" 14 : 16–20, II. 113.
" 14 : 22, 23, I. 178.

Ch. 16, I. 422, II. 63, 80, 131, 133.
" 16 : 20, 21, 36, II. 131.
" 16 : 35, III. 42.
" 16 : 55, II. 290.
" 17 : 22–24, II. 96.
" 17 : 23, III. 57.
" 19 : 16, III. 406.
" 20 : 18, III. 406.
" 20 : 25, I. 223.
" 20 : 30, III. 147.
" 20 : 33, 41–44, II. 64, 84, 86.
" 20 : 35, II. 81, 350, III. 21.
" 21 : 25–27, I. 237, II. 200, 446, III. 27, 399.
" 22 : 28, III. 203.
" 23, 27, II. 714.
" 23 : 6, III. 394.
" 24 : 14, I. 179.
" 29 : 3, III. 16.
" 31 : 3, II. 22.
" 31 : 25–27, I. 347.
" 32 : 7, II. 497.
" 33 : 6, III. 199, 241.
" 34 : 11–31, II. 63, 76–7, III. 388.
" 34 : 17, II. 375.
" 34 : 23, 24, II. 175, 207, 375, III. 572.
" 34 : 24, 30, III. 572, 590.
" 34 : 25, II. 486.
" 34 : 26–7, II. 143.
" 36, 38, 39, II. 58, 61, 108.
" 36 : 8, 29, 30, 35, II. 63, 79, 84, 143.
" 36 : 10, 11, 37, 38, II. 136.
" 36 : 11, 12, II. 76.
" 36 : 22–24, I. 245, II. 53, 84.
" 36 : 25, II. 65.
" 36 : 26–7, I. 336, 615, III. 67, 73.
" 36 : 28, III. 590.
" 36 : 29–35, II. 143.
" 36 : 34–36, I. 427, II. 202, 547.
" 37, II. 177.
" 37 : 1–28, I. 615, II. 84, 86, 96, 189, 250, etc., 263, 476.
" 37 : 12, II. 233.
" 37 : 14, III. 67, 73.
" 37 : 17–22, III. 335, 389.
" 37 : 21, 22, I. 240, 245, 267, II. 63, 83.
" 37 : 22–25, II. 175, 207, 436, 550.
" 37 : 23, 27, II. 142, III. 590.
" 38, II. 699, 709, 761, 767–8.
" 38 : 8, 19, II. 105.
" 38 : 11–13, II. 107.
" 38 : 16, I. 303, II. 338.
" 38 : 17, II. 709.
" 38 : 21, 23, II. 105, 519, 547.
" 39, II. 709.
" 39 : 7, III. 393.
" 39 : 11–16, II. 761, III. 458.
" 39 : 21–23, II. 547.
" 39 : 28, 29, II. 66, 71, 189, III. 67.
" 40–48, II. 83, III. 84, etc.
" 43 : 2, III. 27.
" 43 : 7–11, III. 85.
" 44 : 9, III. 88.
Ch. 44 : 16, III. 611.
" 44 : 22, III. 87.
" 45 : 9, III. 87.
" 45 : 16–25, III. 87.
" 46 : 2, III. 87.
" 46 : 16, II. 88.
" 48 : 22, 23, II. 142.

DANIEL.

Ch. 2 : 7, I. 177, 414, 420, 608, 668, 671, II. 108, 115, 168, 170, 200, 208, 712, 779, III. 190.
" 2 : 19–23, I. 92, 169.
" 2 : 21, II. 191, 189.
" 2 : 28, II. 338.
" 2 : 34, 35, I. 365, 660, II. 502.
" 2 : 35, 45, III. 15, 57.
" 2 : 38, 39, I. 369.
" 2 : 41, 22, 43, II. 642.
" 2 : 43, III. 131.
" 2 : 44, I. 195, 208, II. 117, 497, 631, III. 18, 192.
" 4, II. 774.
" 4 : 13, II. 618.
" 4 : 30, III. 55.
" 4 : 35, I. 92.
" 6 : 26, I. 556.
" 7, II. 364, 628, 688, 699, 707, 712, 713, 718, 767–8, III. 246.
" 7 : 2, II. 527.
" 7 : 5, III. 431.
" 7 : 7, 19, 23, III. 12.
" 7 : 8, 24, II. 749.
" 7 : 9–11, I. 681, II. 105, 266, 320, 358, 377, 509, 510, 519, III. 372.
" 7 : 12, III. 15.
" 7 : 11–26, II. 704.
" 7 : 13, 14, I. 195, 208, 556, 565–7, 577, 616, 660, 681, 698, II. 117, 175, 187, 222, 554, 631, 773, III. 85–6, 335.
" 7 : 14–27, III. 335.
" 7 : 17–23, I. 606, 680.
" 7 : 18, II. 115, 440, 499, 587.
" 7 : 21, 22, II. 142, 574, 581, 583.
" 7 : 25, II. 669.
" 7 : 27, I. 397, 536, 660, 696, II. 93, 436, 583, 620, 669, 773, III. 192, 335.
" 8, II. 688.
" 8 : 5, 6, 20–22, II. 579.
" 8 : 7–19, II. 619.
" 8 : 13, 14, III. 99.
" 8 : 17, I. 446.
" 8 : 19, II. 336.
" 8 : 21, I. 680.
" 8 : 24, II. 758.
" 9 : 4–27, III. 414.
" 9 : 6, I. 171.
" 9 : 20–27, I. 390, 693, II. 355, 659, 669, 741.
" 9 : 24, III. 101.
" 9 : 25, III. 571.
" 9 : 40, I. 446.
" 10 : 5, 7, II. 331.

Ch. 10 : 11–22, II. 659.
" 10 : 13, 14, II. 619.
" 11, 12, II. 736, 752, 761, III. 183.
" 11 : 35, II. 336.
" 11 : 36, II. 669.
" 12, II. 61, 104.
" 12 : 1, II. 618.
" 12 : 2, I. 248, II. 245, etc., 258, 277–8, 301, 464.
" 12 : 3, II. 418, 580, 592.
" 12 : 4, I. 173, III. 127, 150.
" 12 : 6–10, II. 336.
" 12 : 7, III. 99.
" 12 : 9, 12, III. 97.
" 12 : 11, III. 99.
" 12 : 13, I. 446, II. 248–9, 591, 618.

HOSEA.

Ch. 1 : 10, II. 68, 133, 237.
" 2 : 4, II. 131.
" 2 : 14, II. 64, III. 21.
" 2 : 18, II. 486.
" 2 : 19, III. 40.
" 2 : 21, II. 143.
" 2 : 23, II. 68.
" 3 : 4, 5, I. 237, 629, II. 72, 77, 200, 204, III. 400.
" 3 : 5, II. 207, 338, III. 572.
" 3 : 14, II. 258.
" 4 : 6, II. 131, 609.
" 5 : 6, III. 393.
" 5 : 7, II. 131.
" 5 : 14, 15, II. 84, 87, 179, 417.
" 6 : 1–3, I. 420, II. 87, 245, 263, III. 99.
" 6 : 2, II. 464.
" 6 : 3, II. 415, 417.
" 9 : 3, II. 203.
" 9 : 14–17, II. 131.
" 10 : 1, II. 131.
" 13 : 8, II. 748.
" 13 : 14, II. 235, 244, 251, 403.
" 14 : 9, I. 173, III. 151.

JOEL.

Ch. 1 : 10–20, II. 492.
" 2, II. 766, III. 372.
" 2 : 10, II. 497.
" 2 : 18, I. 303, II. 202.
" 2 : 20, II. 761.
" 2 : 21, II. 202.
" 2 : 28–32, II. 29, 143, 566, III. 30, 64, 73, 191.
" 2 : 30, 31, II. 507, III. 162, 164.
" 3, I. 268, 628, II. 104, 318, 369, 495, 508, 654, 742. 768, III. 186, 191, 372.
" 3 : 2, 11, III. 389.
" 3 : 2, 12, II. 761.
" 3 : 9–21, II. 374, 519, 753, 765.
" 3 : 11, II. 576, 582.
" 3 : 12, II. 177.
" 3 : 13, II. 181, 407, III. 185.
" 3 : 14, II, 662–3.
" 3 : 15, II. 686, III. 162, 395.
" 3 : 16, II. 752.
" 3 : 17, I. 245, 427, II. 143, III. 32.
" 3 : 27–30, II. 550.

AMOS.

Ch. 1 : 3, II. 662.
" 1 : 4, III. 81.
" 3 : 2, I. 215.
" 3 : 7, II. 334.
" 4 : 7, 8, I. 173.
" 8 : 9, III. 162.
" 9, I. 234.
" 9 : 5, II. 519.
" 9 : 8, II. 56.
" 9 : 9, II. 65.
" 9 : 11, I. 240, 347, 629, II. 76, 78, 200.
" 9 : 11–15. II. 203, 548, III. 24.
" 9 : 12, II. 93.
" 9 : 13, II. 143.

OBADIAH.

Ch. 21, I. 509.

JONAH.

Ch. 18 : 7–9, I. 176.

MICAH.

Ch. 2 : 8, I. 685.
" 2 : 12, 13, II. 79, 84, 144, 198, 235, III. 203, 389.
" 3 : 4, III. 33.
" 3 : 12, II. 178, III. 55.
" 4, III. 30.
" 4 : 1–7, I. 446, 685, II. 142, 178, 214, 304, 338, 423, 519, III. 55, 190, 355.
" 4 : 2, 3, II. 93, 152, 195, 610.
" 4 : 3, 4, III. 596.
" 4 : 5–8, I. 267, 347, 427, II. 64, 92.
" 4 : 8, II. 142, 291, III. 81.
" 4 : 11–13, II. 108, 663, 752, 760, 765, III. 396.
" 5 : 1, II. 356, III. 534.
" 5 : 2–4, I. 629, II. 76, 257, III. 403, 417.
" 5 : 5, I. 328, II. 714.
" 5 : 7, II. 418.
" 5 : 8–10, II. 108.
" 7 : 7, 8, II. 256, 306.
" 7 : 14, III. 389.
" 7 : 15, 20, I. 295, 300, 427, II. 84, 91, 108, 137, 144, 338.
" 7 : 16, 17, I. 496, II. 768, III. 81.
" 8 : 2, II. 579.
" 8 : 19, II. 393.

NAHUM.

Ch. 1 : 2, 3, I. 753.
" 1 : 4, III. 394.
" 1 : 5, II. 519, 549.

HABAKKUK.

Ch. 1 : 12, II. 278.
" 1 : 15, II. 757.
" 2 : 1–4, III. 330.
" 2 : 3, II. 753.
" 2 : 5, II. 699.
" 2 : 14, III. 210.
" 3, I. 32, II. 765, III. 246, 392, etc.
" 3 : 3, III. 21.
" 3 : 16, II. 767.
" 3 : 17, III. 152.

ZEPHANIAH.

Ch. 1 : 12–18, II. 79.
" 2 : 2, 3, II. 325, 508.
" 2 : 9, II. 290.
" 2 : 14, II. 379.
" 3, II. 369, 742.
" 3 : 5, II. 416, 417.
" 3 : 8–20, II. 64, 79, 84, 87, 106, 259, 320, 374, 753, 765, 768, III. 24, 185–6, 372, 389, 590.
" 3 : 9, II. 143, 145, III. 190.
" 3 : 10, II. 291.
" 3 : 14, II. 138.
" 3 : 14–20, I. 427, II. 61.
" 3 : 15, II. 198.
" 3 : 19, 20, II. 94.

HAGGAI.

Ch. 2 : 6, II. 494, etc.
" 2 : 7–9, III. 418.
" 2 : 22, II. 494.
" 2 : 23, II. 582.

ZECHARIAH.

Ch. 1 : 5, 6, I. 179.
" 1 : 9, 12, 14, 19, II. 619.
" 1 : 16, 17, I. 347.
" 1 : 20, II. 114.
" 2 : 3, 5, II. 132, 619.
" 2 : 8, 9, III. 399.
" 2 : 10–13, II. 138, 179, 189, 198, III. 32.
" 2 : 11, III. 190.
" 2 : 12, I. 347, 427, II. 201, 203, III. 50.
" 3, 4, II. 79.
" 5, 11, II. 705.
" 6 : 8, II. 180.
" 6 : 12, I. 615.
" 6 : 13, II. 602.
" 7 : 14, II. 60.
" 8, II. 64, 143, III. 32, 55.
" 8 : 2–8, II. 72.
" 8 : 3, I. 427, II. 92, 179, III. 56.
" 8 : 4, II. 548.
" 8 : 6, II. 64.
" 8 : 10, III. 153.
" 8 : 12, II. 143.
" 8 : 13, II. 94, 142.
" 8 : 20–23, II. 93, 142, III. 64, 190.
" 9, II. 769.
" 9 : 4, I. 184, 266, 458.
" 9 : 9, II. 291, 502, 758.
Ch. 9 : 10, II. 142, III. 190, 210.
" 9 : 11–17, II. 106, 108, 251, 256, III. 395, 431.
" 9 : 14–16, III. 24, 389.
" 9 : 16, II. 114.
" 10, 12, 14, I. 427, II. 105–7, 142.
" 10 : 2, II. 748.
" 10 : 3, II. 375.
" 10 : 3–12, II. 108.
" 10 : 6, I. 215.
" 10 : 10, 11, II. 91.
" 12, III. 221.
" 12 : 1–14, II. 61, 84, 93, 104, 108.
" 12 : 2, II. 85.
" 12 : 2, 3, 9, II. 112, 752–3.
" 12 : 6–9, II. 115, 142, 766, III. 81.
" 12 : 7, II. 85.
" 12 : 9–14, I. 628, III. 414.
" 12 : 10, II. 81, 85, 179, 188–9, 200, 350, III. 191, 415, 532.
" 13 : 7–9, I. 629.
" 13 : 9, III. 478.
" 14, I. 268, 273, 420, 685, II. 318, 345, 365, 368, 370, 375, 549, 761, 768, III. 33–4, 162, 389.
" 14 : 1, II. 58, 350, 655, 664.
" 14 : 1–15, II. 61, 74, 188, 194, 519, 654–5, 664, 710, 731, 742, 771.
Ch. 14 : 2, II. 85, 664–5.
" 14 : 3–5, II. 79, 187, 759.
" 14 : 4, II. 144, 178, 377, III. 19, 27, 189, 265.
" 14 : 5, I. 249, II. 11, 175, 318, 320, 385, 576, 766, III. 245.
" 14 : 5, 12, 15, 18, III. 394.
" 14 : 6, 7, II. 418, 419.
" 14 : 8, II. 189, III. 187.
" 14 : 9, I. 208, II. 11, 117, III. 190, 335, 339.
" 14 : 10, III. 50.
" 14 : 12–18, II. 90, 104, 145, III. 81, 89, 598.
" 14 : 14, II. 107.
" 14 : 16, III. 30, 90, 185–6, 335, 339, 596.
" 14 : 17–22, II. 142, III. 81, 89.
" 14 : 18, II. 148.
" 14 : 20, 21, II. 142, 486, 569, III. 463.

MALACHI.

Ch. 2 : 7, II. 609.
" 2 : 17, II. 332.
" 3 : 4, I. 225.
" 3 : 1, 2, II. 162, 194, III. 418.
" 3 : 2–4, II. 84.
" 3 : 16–18, II. 140, 259, 325, 387, III. 130.
" 3 : 17, II. 592.
" 4, II. 377, 416, 442, 508, III. 185–6.
" 4 : 1, 2, 3, II. 227, 377, 507, III. 245.
" 4 : 5, 6, II. 87, 409, 471, 565–6, III. 68, 102, 162.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW.

Ch. 1, I. 352.
" 1 : 28, III. 351.
" 1 : 23, III. 542.
" 2 : 4–6, III. 571.
" 2 : 5, II. 619.
" 2 : 13, 19, II. 619.
" 2 : 15, II. 201.
" 2 : 16, 17, II. 195.
" 2 : 17, 18, II. 253.
" 3 : 1, I. 42, 102, III. 532.
" 3 : 2, I. 39. 43, 252, 278, 283, 339, 370, 431, 633, II. 43, 83.
" 3 : 5, II. 379.
" 3 : 9, I. 179, 209, 230, 253, 387, 396, III. 221.
" 3 : 10, I. 415.
" 3 : 11, III. 65.
" 3 : 16, II. 197.
" 4 : 1–11, I. 698, 701.
" 4 : 2, II. 239, 299.
" 4 : 3, I. 562.
" 4 : 9, III. 188.
" 4 : 11, II. 618.
" 4 : 17, I. 263, 362, 696.
" 4 : 23, I. 269, II. 43.
" 5 : 3, I. 283.
" 5 : 5, I. 589, II. 434, 436, 439, 440, 446, 499.
" 5 : 10–12. I. 13, 14, II. 11, 13.
" 5 : 11, III. 233.
" 5 : 12, II. 612, 739.
" 5 : 16, II. 390.
" 5 : 18, III. 295.
" 5 : 19, 20, I. 39, II. 591, III. 199, 226.
" 6 : 10, I. 29, 370, 657, 689.
" 6 : 20, II. 391.
" 6 : 25–34, III. 341.
" 6 : 32, II. 35.
" 6 : 33, III. 79.
" 7 : 8–10, I. 53.
" 7 : 14–23, I. 67, 78, 132, 417.
" 7 : 21–23, II. 384, 411, III. 193, 204.
" 7 : 24–27, I. 78.
" 7 : 33, II. 596, III. 388.
" 8 : 5–13, I. 357.
" 8 : 10, II. 67.
" 8 : 11, 12, I. 267, 602, 633, II. 33, 43.
" 8 : 13, 14, I. 550.
" 8 : 17, II. 145, III. 425.
" 8 : 20, II. 207.
" 8 : 28–34, II. 621.
" 8 : 29, I. 562.
" 9 : 6, III. 541.
" 9 : 15, I. 688, II. 42, III. 318.
" 9 : 16, I. 617, II. 69.
" 9 : 18, II. 267.
" 9 : 22, II. 301.
Ch. 9 : 27, I. 354.
" 9 : 35, I. 269.
" 10 : 1, 8, I. 90, 276.
" 10 : 5, 6, I. 356, 359.
" 10 : 7, I. 278.
" 10 : 23, II. 35, 563, etc.
" 10 : 27, II. 20.
" 10 : 28, III. 261.
" 10 : 29, III. 341.
" 10 : 32, 33, II. 379, 384.
" 10 : 39, II. 739.
" 10 : 40–42, II. 376.
" 10 : 42, II. 388.
" 11 : 1–6, I. 430.
" 11 : 2, 3, 5, I. 262, 283, II. 191, 198.
" 11 : 5, 20, I. 90.
" 11 : 7–15, I. 253.
" 11 : 11–13, I. 39, 252–3, 264, 270, 447, 606, 616, II. 33, 35, 43, 592.
" 11 : 14, II. 566.
" 11 : 18, I. 264.
" 11 : 25, III. 33.
" 11 : 27, III. 532.
" 12 : 8, III. 541.
" 12 : 14–23, I. 354, 410.
" 12 : 12 : 18–21, III. 425.
" 12 : 23, III. 514.
" 12 : 28, I. 89, 369, 370, 421, 657, II. 28, 42.
" 12 : 31, 32, II. 405, III. 79.
" 12 : 36, II. 385, 387.
" 12 : 40, I. 50.
" 12 : 50, II. 376.
" 13 : 1–23, III. 186.
" 13 : 10, II. 18.
" 13 : 11–16, I. 141, 283, 430, II. 16, 18.
" 13 : 19, II. 314.
" 13 : 24–30, I. 39, II. 21, 181, III. 175.
" 13 : 31–33, I. 39, 201, 657, II. 22, 27, 33, 237, 300, 619, III. 175.
" 13 : 34, 35, I. 34, II. 23.
" 13 : 39–43, I. 577, II. 167, 176, 269, 516.
" 13 : 40, 42, II. 177.
" 13 : 41–43, I. 283, 414, II. 167, 592, III. 541.
" 13 : 44–46, I. 39, II. 23, 384, 408, 420–1.
" 13 : 47–50, II. 24.
" 13 : 52, I. 20, 39.
" 14 : 20, I. 617.
" 14 : 33, I. 562.
" 15 : 8, 9, III. 425.
" 15 : 9, I. 132.
" 15 : 21–28, I. 357.
" 15 : 22, I. 354.
" 15 : 24–30, I. 201, 356.
" 16 : 3, III. 108, 110.
" 16 : 11–28, I. 430, 478, 566, 568, II. 35, 43, 165.
" 16 : 13–20, I. 42, 275, 385.

Ch. 16 : 16, 17, I. 441, II. 556, III. 515, 534, 572.
" 16 : 18, 19, I. 39, 602, 663. II. 258, 299.
" 16 : 21, I. 375, II. 176, 618, 739.
" 16 : 25. 27, I. 267, 560, II. 167, 183, 344, 374, 378, 388, 396, 554, 618, 739.
" 16 : 28, I. 283, II. 560.
" 17 : 10, II. 565.
" 17 : 11, I. 367.
" 17 : 20. I. 185, III. 478.
" 17 : 26–31, II. 105, 239.
" 17 : 27, II. 766.
" 17 : 32, II. 299.
" 18 : 3, I. 102.
" 18 : 10, II. 351, 618.
" 18 : 16, 17, I. 632.
" 18 : 19, 20, I. 132, 616.
" 18 : 23, 25, II. 24.
" 19 : 8. I. 223.
" 19 : 13, 14, III. 262.
" 19 : 21, II. 11.
" 19 : 24, I. 39.
" 19 : 26, I. 92.
" 19 : 28. I. 179, 267, 349, 373, 569, II. 50, 178, 182, 257–8, 266, 268, 300, 375, 473, etc., 478, 583, 586–7.
" 19 : 28–30, II. 388–9, III. 323.
" 20 : 16, I. 78.
" 20 : 17–20. I. 383.
" 20 : 18, 19, I. 375.
" 20 : 20, 21, I. 184, 210, 266, 274, 283, III. 572.
" 20 : 20–29, II. 388, 585.
" 20 : 23, III. 30.
" 20 : 27, II. 24, 269.
" 20 : 28, I. 275.
" 20 : 30, 31, I. 354.
" 21, I. 386.
" 21 : 1–11, II. 564.
" 21 : 8, 9, I. 266, II. 191.
" 21 : 15, 16, I. 349, III. 33.
" 21 : 26, II. 379.
" 21 : 28, III. 323.
" 21 : 31, I. 39.
" 21 : 33, I. 207.
" 21 : 42, 43, III. 601.
" 21 : 43, I. 379, 392, 608, 696, II. 577.
" 21 : 44, I. 673, 676, 681.
" 22 : 1–14, I. 379, 550, II. 24, 392, III. 307.
" 22 : 11, III. 323.
" 22 : 21, I. 660.
" 22 : 24, I. 365.
" 22 : 30, I. 298, II. 620.
" 22 : 31, 32, I. 297, 447, II. 231, 299.
" 22 : 42–45, III. 417, 512.
" 23 : 6, II. 235.
" 23 : 8, I. 385.
" 23 : 13, II. 35.
" 23 : 20, 21, I. 458, 464.
" 23 : 27, II. 79.
" 23 : 29, III. 323.
" 23 : 37–39, I. 380, 383, 432, 628, 664, 688, II. 50, 51, 77, 98, 105, 178, 187, 191, 320, 350, III. 55.
Ch. 24, I. 381, 479, 688, 692, II. 174, 184, 373, 424, III. 183, 186, 215, 258.
" 24 : 3, I. 211, 380, II. 420–1.
" 24 : 4, 14, 24, 25, 33, III. 108.
" 24 : 6–14, I. 446, II. 105, 375, 406, 546.
" 24 : 8, II. 737.
" 24 : 12, III. 138.
" 24 : 14, II. 33, 174, III. 104, 117, 137, 192.
" 24 : 15, I. 48, 171, II. 251, 278, 650, III. 151.
" 24 : 21, II. 731, 737.
" 24 : 23–27, III. 323.
" 24 : 24, II. 740.
" 24 : 25, I. 194, III. 135.
" 24 : 28, II. 176, 322.
" 24 : 29, I. 420, 580, II. 189, 318, 495, III. 68, 112, 164, 246, 372, 384–5.
" 24 : 30, II. 171, 187, 318, 327, 357, 378, 410, 576, III. 175, 186, 299, 323.
" 24 : 31, I. 412, II. 330, 453.
" 24 : 32, III. 110.
" 24 : 34, I. 381.
" 24 : 36–51, II. 173, 211, 332, 378, 410, III. 93, 100, 108, 111, 299, 323.
" 24 : 37–39, III. 323.
" 24 : 39–41, III. 297, 323.
" 24 : 42–44, I. 536, III. 139, 300, 323.
" 24 : 46, 47, II. 577, III. 596.
" 24 : 48, II. 165.
" 25 : I. 240, III. 183, 186.
" 25 : 1–13, II. 24, 170, 182, III. 27, 299, etc., 323.
" 25 : 10, II. 384.
" 25 : 13, III. 93, 100, 323.
" 25 : 14–30, II. 388.
" 25 : 19, I. 694, II. 189, 577, III. 323.
" 25 : 21–23, II. 387.
" 25 : 30, I. 463.
" 25 : 31–34, II. 396, 436, 473, 578, 587, III. 323, 541.
" 25 : 31–46, I. 566, 568, 585, 600, 619, II. 21, 177, 181, 203, 270, 318, 320, 353, 372, etc., 384, 519, 542, III. 406.
" 25 : 34, I. 34, 39, 244, 267, 373, 413, 414, III. 310.
" 25 : 41, III. 245.
" 26 : 2. II. 46.
" 26 : 6, 7, II. 235, 253, 298–9, 305.
" 26 : 18, II. 249.
" 26 : 20, II. 189, 191.
" 26 : 24, II. 166.
" 26 : 28, I. 327, 371.
" 26 : 29, I. 39, 283, 323, 373, 577, II. 37, 548, III. 56, 464.
" 26 : 51, 52, II. 618.
" 26 : 63, 64, I. 367, 562, 568, 673, II. 171, 176, 187, 192, 374, 618, III. 323.
" 27 : 37, 42, III. 571.
" 27 : 52, 53, II. 229, 233, 253, 282, 315.
" 28 : 11–20, III. 192–3.
" 28 : 18–20, I. 696, II. 375, 420.

Ch. 28 : 19, III. 65, 191.
" 28 : 20, III. 478.
" 28 : 29, III. 532.

MARK.

Ch. 1-16, III. 352.
" 1 : 2, II. 35.
" 1 : 12, 13, I. 689.
" 1 : 14, 15, I. 266, 362.
" 1 : 24, II. 621.
" 3 : 11, I. 562.
" 3 : 29, III. 79.
" 4 : 11, 12 I. 141, 151, 283, II. 16, 18.
" 4 : 26–29 I. 114, 200.
" 4 : 34, II. 19, 22.
" 5 : 7, I. 562.
" 7 : 25–30, I. 357.
" 8 : 20, II. 70.
" 8 : 29, III. 572.
" 8 : 35, II. 737.
" 8 : 38, I. 569, II. 166, 372, 384, 554, 619, III. 323.
" 9 : 1, I. 35, 283, 478.
" 9 : 9, I. 447.
" 9 : 10, 11, II. 299.
" 9 : 12, I. 367.
" 9 : 29, II. 556.
" 9 : 31, I. 415.
" 9 : 41, II. 376, 388.
" 9 : 47, I. 102, 632.
" 10 : 5, I. 223.
" 10 : 6, II. 480.
" 10 : 15, I. 39.
" 10 : 25, I. 92.
" 10 : 30, II. 388.
" 10 : 35–45, II. 587.
" 10 : 40, II. 14..
" 10 : 47–52, I. 354.
" 11 : 10, I. 349, 632, II. 205.
" 11 : 12, I. 633.
" 12 : 10, I. 365.
" 12 : 26–37, I. 74, 354, II. 344, 378.
" 12 : 34, I. 370.
" 13, I. 381, II. 184, III. 117, 186, 215.
" 13 : 1, 2, I. 628.
" 13 : 6–13, II. 105, 174.
" 13 : 11, I. 74, II. 301.
" 13 : 14, III. 151, 164.
" 13 : 19, II. 480.
" 13 : 23, III. 135, 151.
" 13 : 25, II. 495, III. 164.
" 13 : 26, I. 567–9, II. 187, III. 323.
" 13 : 27, I. 412.
" 13 : 28, 29, III. 110.
" 13 : 32, 33, I. 580, II. 41, III. 93, 101, 323.
" 13 : 33–37, III. 100, 114, 219, 253, 323.
" 14 : 25, I. 373, II. 37, 548.
" 14 : 61, 62, III. 323, 575.
" 14 : 62, I. 385, III. 384.
" 15 : 32, III. 571.
" 15 : 43, I. 283, 367, II. 143.
" 16 : 11, II. 267.
Ch. 16 : 14, I. 138.
" 16 : 15, II. 492, III. 191, 331.

LUKE.

Ch. 1-24, III. 353.
" 1 : 1–3, I. 72.
" 1 : 15, 35, 41, 67, III. 10, 73.
" 1 : 15, 18, I. 257.
" 1 : 16, 54, 68, II. 67, 565.
" 1 : 17, II. 566.
" 1 : 30–33, I. 313, 342.
" 1 : 31, I. 283, III. 571.
" 1 : 32, 33, I. 236, 240, 285, 577, 616, 649, II. 50, 74, 77, 201, 203, 206, 551, 630–1, III. 309, 539, 571.
" 1 : 35, II. 197.
" 1 : 37, I. 92.
" 1 : 51–53, I. 415.
" 1 : 69–75, I. 295, III. 450.
" 1 : 70, I. 173.
" 1 : 71–74, I. 183, 236, 240, 262, 273, 285, 458, 577, 616, 649, II. 50, 95, 98, 137, 201, 203, 206.
" 1 : 76, II. 351.
" 1 : 77, III. 450.
" 2 : 1, II. 406, 546.
" 2 : 9–14, II. 618.
" 2 : 11, III. 571.
" 2 : 25, II. 464, III. 70.
" 2 : 26–30, I. 183, III. 70.
" 2 : 52, I. 580.
" 3 : 16, III. 65.
" 3 : 23–28, I. 353.
" 4 : 1–13, I. 698.
" 4 : 5, II. 406, 546.
" 4 : 6, I. 701, III. 188.
" 4 : 18, 19, I. 365.
" 4 : 23, I. 266.
" 4 : 34, I. 362.
" 4 : 41, I. 562, II. 621, III. 571.
" 5 : 33–35, I. 442, III. 314.
" 6 : 20, I. 283.
" 6 : 22, 23, II. 739.
" 7 : 1, etc., I. 357.
" 7 : 19, II. 191.
" 7 : 27, II. 351.
" 7 : 28, I. 253.
" 8 : 1, I. 266.
" 8 : 10, II. 16.
" 8 : 11–23, II. 266.
" 8 : 21, II. 376.
" 9 : 3, II. 559.
" 9 : 10, II. 564.
" 9 : 20, II. 556, III. 572.
" 9 : 26, I. 569, II. 374, 554, 619, III. 323.
" 9 : 27, I. 283, 478, II. 35.
" 9 : 28, II. 554.
" 9 : 30, II. 560.
" 9 : 56–70, I. 102, 182, 375.
" 9 : 62, II. 36.
" 10 : 1, etc., I. 361, II. 564.
" 10 : 9, I. 278.
" 10 : 17, I. 276, II. 621.

Ch. 10 : 18, **II.** 12.
" 10 : 20, **II.** 13.
" 10 : 21, **II.** 301.
" 10 : 23, 24, **I.** 371.
" 11 : 2, **I.** 370, 689.
" 11 : 13, **I.** 117.
" 11 : 20, **I.** 362, 370, 390, 421, **II.** 42.
" 11 : 42, **II.** 733.
" 11 : 50, **I.** 34.
" 11 : 52, **III.** 108.
" 12, **III.** 258.
" 12 : 8, 9, **II.** 618.
" 12 : 10, **III.** 79.
" 12 : 12, **I.** 77, **III.** 70.
" 12 : 13, **I.** 660.
" 12 : 31, **I.** 370, **II.** 14, 35.
" 12 : 32, **I.** 414, 589, 632, **II.** 14, 35, **III.** 57, 310.
" 12 : 35–48, **II.** 167, 189, 318, 589, **III.** 100, 301, 323.
" 12 : 36, **III.** 27.
" 12 : 37–49, **III.** 241, 323.
" 12 : 40, **III.** 93.
" 12 : 42–44, **III.** 323.
" 12 : 45, **III.** 153, 323.
" 12 : 49, **I.** 618.
" 12 : 51–53, **III.** 196.
" 13 : 20, 21, **II.** 22.
" 13 : 23–30, **II.** 392.
" 13 : 28, 29, **I.** 267, **II.** 290, **III.** 310.
" 13 : 33, **III.** 99.
" 13 : 34, 35, **I.** 628, 664, **II.** 51, 77, 178, 190–1, **III.** 323.
" 14 : 14, **II.** 227, 265–6, 269, 291–2, 299, 302, 307, 396, 476.
" 14 : 15–24, **I.** 379, **II.** 253, 300.
" 15 : 10, **II.** 619.
" 16 : 16, **I.** 252, 264, 370, **II.** 35.
" 16 : 31, **I.** 160.
" 17 : 19, 20, **II.** 198.
" 17 : 20, **I.** 370, 458, 660, **II.** 33, 39, etc., 41, etc., 46.
" 17 : 21, **I.** 42, 390, 560, **II.** 365.
" 17 : 22, **I.** 43, 442, 651, 688, **II.** 190, 351, 412, **III.** 314.
" 17 : 23, 24, **III.** 323.
" 17 : 24, **II.** 183, 410.
" 17 : 26–30, **II.** 105, 318, **III.** 112, 114, 185, 209, 323.
" 17 : 34–37, **I.** 382, **II.** 319, etc., **III.** 323.
" 18 : 1–8, **III.** 309.
" 18 : 7, 8, **I.** 413, 634, **II.** 190, **III.** 115, 116, 165, 175, 185, 217, 323, 384.
" 18 : 27, **I.** 92.
" 18 : 30, **II.** 388.
" 18 : 38, **I.** 354.
" 19 : 1, etc., **I.** 357.
" 19 : 11–27, **I.** 366, 577, **II.** 25, 365, 387–8, 577, 587.
" 19 : 14, **I.** 375, **III.** 327.
" 19 : 17–19, **II.** 591.
" 19 : 39, **I.** 349.
" 19 : 41–44, **I.** 380, 383.
Ch. 20 : 25, **II.** 239.
" 20 : 34–36, **II.** 238, 268, 275, 292, 297, 299, 307–8, 421–2, 620.
" 20 : 37, **I.** 296.
" 21 : **I.** 381, 419, 569, **II.** 184, **III.** 117, 186, 215.
" 21 : 24, **I.** 43, **II.** 49, 51, 72, 98, 375.
" 21 : 24–30, **II.** 388, **III.** 106, 139.
" 21 : 25, 28, **II.** 186, 189, 318, 724, **III.** 164, 396.
" 21 : 26, **II.** 406, 495, 546, **III.** 372.
" 21 : 27, 28, **I.** 569, **II.** 154, 171, 187, 378, 477, **III.** 110, 170, 372.
" 21 : 29, **III.** 126.
" 21 : 31, 32, **I.** 382, 419, 688, **II.** 46, 365.
" 21 : 34, **III.** 100, 323–4.
" 21 : 35, **II.** 186, **III.** 93.
" 21 : 36, **II.** 322, 332, **III.** 24.
" 22 : 15, 16, **III.** 26.
" 22 : 16–18, **II.** 37, 225.
" 22 : 18, **I.** 373, **II.** 548.
" 22 : 28–30, **I.** 267, 373, 414, 577, 589, 619, 632, **II.** 34, 37, 191, 268, 581, 583, 587, 590, 592, **III.** 56, 390.
" 22 : 32, **II.** 324.
" 22 : 36–38, **II.** 115, 349.
" 22 : 43, **II.** 618.
" 22 : 53, **II.** 256.
" 22 : 69, **II.** 618.
" 23 : 2, 3, **I.** 396.
" 23 : 30, **II.** 195.
" 24 : **III.** 193.
" 24 : 21, **I.** 184, 274, 458, **III.** 572.
" 24 : 25, **II.** 267, **III.** 202.
" 24 : 24, **II.** 758.
" 24 : 25–27, **I.** 171, 350, **II.** 34, **III.** 108, 397, 425.
" 24 : 32, **I.** 117.
" 24 : 34, **II.** 349.
" 24 : 41, **I.** 266.
" 24 : 47, **I.** 389, 416, **III.** 331.
" 24 : 49, **I.** 77, **III.** 191.

JOHN.

Ch. 1–21, **III.** 354–6.
" 1 : 1, **III.** 532.
" 1 : 3, **I.** 559.
" 1 : 3–10, **III.** 478, 532.
" 1 : 7, **I.** 257.
" 1 : 11, **I.** 302, 375, **II.** 35, 207.
" 1 : 12, **I.** 403.
" 1 : 14, **II.** 559.
" 1 : 21–24, **I.** 216, **II.** 566.
" 1 : 29, **III.** 391, 454.
" 1 : 33, **III.** 65.
" 1 : 41, **III.** 573.
" 1 : 51, **I.** 571, **II.** 143–4, 341, 618, **III.** 446.
" 2 : 19, **III.** 90.
" 2 : 24, 25, **III.** 478.
" 2 : 28, **II.** 221.
" 3 : 2, **I.** 92.
" 3 : 3–5, **II.** 35.

Ch. 3 : 5, I. 39.
" 3 : 8, II. 300.
" 3 : 13, I. 151, 571, 661.
" 3 : 14, I. 50.
" 3 : 16–19, 36, I. 67, 138, II. 386, 393, III. 284, 514.
" 3 : 19, 20, III. 279.
" 3 : 24, II. 70, 73.
" 3 : 26, II. 379.
" 3 : 34, III. 70.
" 4 : 4, I. 356.
" 4 : 22, I. 398.
" 4 : 23, II. 301.
" 4 : 25, III. 573.
" 4 : 27, I. 571.
" 5 : 3, III. 532.
" 5 : 18, III. 530.
" 5 : 19–38, III. 532.
" 5 : 21–26, I. 53, II. 257–8, III. 532.
" 5 : 22, 23, II. 352–3, 587, III. 479, 530, 532, 535.
" 5 : 24, I. 138, II. 387, 393.
" 5 : 25, 26, I. 562, II. 234, 252, 267.
" 5 : 27, I. 569, 574, II. 587.
" 5 : 28, 29, II. 174, 229, 278, 290, 301, 384.
" 5 : 36–39, I. 48, 90, 117, III. 514.
" 5 : 39–45, III. 108, 284.
" 5 : 43, II. 722, 748.
" 5 : 44–47, I. 138, III. 225.
" 6 : 14, II. 198.
" 6 : 15, I. 266, 376.
" 6 : 30, I. 446.
" 6 : 37–40, II. 386.
" 6 : 39–44, II. 230, 251, 300.
" 6 : 40, I. 137.
" 6 : 45, II. 304, 423.
" 6 : 54–58, II. 256, 423.
" 6 : 62, 63, I. 53, 561, III. 68.
" 7 : 17, I. 67, III. 280.
" 7 : 30, III. 341.
" 7 : 31, III. 514.
" 7 : 34–44, I. 210.
" 7 : 38, 39, III. 73.
" 8 : 20, III. 341.
" 8 : 24, I. 148.
" 8 : 36, II. 239.
" 8 : 47, I. 117.
" 8 : 56, I. 296, 309, II. 410.
" 8 : 58, III. 479, 532.
" 9 : 5, II. 194.
" 10 : 11–16, III. 175.
" 10 : 17–18, III. 480.
" 10 : 25–38, I. 90, II. 386.
" 10 : 30, III. 478, 530.
" 10 : 35, III. 233.
" 10 : 36, I. 562, III. 530.
" 11 : 4, I. 562.
" 11 : 24, II. 228, 231, 251, 299, 422.
" 11 : 25, 26, II. 231, 314.
" 11 : 27, II. 198.
" 11 : 41–44, II. 233.
" 11 : 47, 48, I. 376.
Ch. 12 : 1–9, II. 308.
" 12 : 25, II. 739.
" 12 : 27–29, II. 256, 331.
" 12 : 31, II. 359, III. 188–9.
" 12 : 32–34, I. 383, II. 420, 638, III. 514, 539.
" 12 : 37, II. 35.
" 12 : 41, III. 538.
" 12 : 45, III. 478.
" 12 : 47, 48, I. 67, II. 423
" 12 : 49, III. 93.
" 13 : 3, III. 479.
" 13 : 19, III. 360.
" 13 : 31, I. 571.
" 14 : 1–3, II. 403, 532, III. 42, 53, etc., 59, 63, 323.
" 14 : 7–11, III. 478.
" 14 : 9, II. 637, III. 557.
" 14 : 10, III. 532.
" 14 : 11, I. 91.
" 14 : 12–14, III. 390.
" 14 : 15, 21, 23, III. 265.
" 14 : 16, II. 197, III. 191.
" 14 : 25–28, I. 55, III. 532.
" 14 : 26, III. 73.
" 14 : 29, I. 167.
" 14 : 30, II. 142, III. 188.
" 15 : 10, III. 265.
" 15 : 18, III. 175.
" 15 : 19, II. 514, III. 184.
" 15 : 20, II. 739.
" 15 : 36, III. 73.
" 16 : 7–26, I. 624, II. 197, 344, III. 73, 191.
" 16 : 13–15, I. 77, III. 532.
" 16 : 16–33, II. 33, III. 314, 323.
" 16 : 23, 24, III. 390.
" 16 : 30, III. 478.
" 17 : 2, 3, II. 386.
" 17 : 5, I. 561, III. 534.
" 17 : 8, III. 93.
" 17 : 9, III. 186.
" 17 : 10, III. 478.
" 17 : 11–13, II. 42.
" 17 : 14–16, III. 184.
" 17 : 16–20, III. 65.
" 17 : 20, III. 331.
" 17 : 21, III. 338.
" 17 : 22, III. 48.
" 17 : 24, I. 34.
" 17 : 25, II. 33.
" 17 : 26, III. 73.
" 18 : 33, I. 349.
" 18 : 36, I. 367, 660, II. 32, 109, 514.
" 18 : 37, I. 134, II. 38.
" 19 : 7, III. 530.
" 19 : 32, III. 431.
" 19 : 34, 37, III. 532.
" 19 : 35, 36, III. 360.
" 20 : 17, II. 376, 444.
" 20 : 21, III. 193.
" 20 : 27, III. 284.
" 20 : 30, 31, I. 90, 132, III. 571.
" 21 : 22, 23, I. 478, II. 172, 190.

ACTS.

Ch. 1 : III. 358.
" 1 : 3, I. 430, II. 267.
" 1 : 5, III. 65–6.
" 1 : 6, I. 183–4, 195, 265–6, 270, 274, 278, 283–4, 366, 373, 414, 429, 430, 456, 458, 472, 580, 641, 665, 689, 699, II. 16, 19, 22, 34, 38, 41, 72, 78, 152, 191, 204–5, 383, 421, 471, III. 56, 245, 572–3.
" 1 : 6, 7, III. 93–4, 108.
" 1 : 7, I. 580, II. 41, 72, 189.
" 1 : 10, 11, 12, I. 536, II. 165, 178, 181, 188, 221, 619.
" 1 : 11, III. 60, 323, 384.
" 1 : 16, I. 70, 74.
" 2 : 4, I. 92, II. 145.
" 2 : 7, I. 8.
" 2 : 9–11, III. 169.
" 2 : 14–36, I. 316, 438, III. 66, 69.
" 2 : 16, 17, I. 446, II. 338.
" 2 : 19–21, III. 323.
" 2 : 20, II. 492.
" 2 : 22, I. 90, 92, II. 758.
" 2 : 23, I. 383.
" 2 : 26, 30, I. 383.
" 2 : 27, 31, I. 458, II. 258, 270, 293.
" 2 : 30, 31, I. 70, 313, 314, 339, 353, 565, II. 77, III. 579.
" 2 : 33, III. 73, 191.
" 2 : 34, 35, II. 344.
" 2 : 38, I. 408.
" 2 : 41, II. 266, III. 184.
" 2 : 42, I. 112.
" 2 : 47, III. 451.
" 3 : 9–27, II. 461, etc., 484.
" 3 : 12–26, I. 316, 413, 416, 438, 615, II. 79.
" 3 : 19–22, I. 389, 615, 668, II. 51, 72, 300, 344, 350, III. 73, 459.
" 3 : 20, II. 293, 492, III. 579.
" 3 : 21, I. 41, 578, II. 153.
" 3 : 33, I. 266.
" 4 : 10, III. 579.
" 4 : 19, III. 12.
" 4 : 26–28, I. 615, III. 576.
" 5 : III. 81.
" 5 : 19, 20, II. 619, III. 12.
" 5 : 29–31, I. 615.
" 5 : 31, I. 570, 688.
" 5 : 32, III. 65, 68, 79.
" 5 : 38, 39, III. 342.
" 5 : 42, III. 579.
" 6 : 7, I. 280, III. 184.
" 7 : 5, I. 294.
" 7 : 14, II. 293.
" 7 : 35–37, III. 426.
" 7 : 53, II. 619.
" 7 : 56, I. 576.
" 8 : 1, I. 632.
" 8 : 5–24, III. 65, 579.
" 8 : 12, I. 600.
" 8 : 14–17, III. 70, 77.
" 8 : 26, II. 619.
" 8 : 30–37, III. 284.
" 8 : 32, 33, III. 425.
" 8 : 39, II. 314.
" 9 : 20, 22, III. 574, 579.
" 9 : 28, III. 70.
" 9 : 41, II. 267.
" 10 : 1–48, I. 408.
" 10 : 3, II. 619.
" 10 : 11–15, I. 232.
" 10 : 36, 37, I. 467.
" 10 : 40, II. 353.
" 10 : 42, II. 392.
" 10 : 44–46, III. 65.
" 11 : I. 408.
" 11 : 15, 17, III. 65.
" 11 : 28, II. 406.
" 12 : 21, II. 355.
" 13 : III. 81.
" 13 : 17, II. 67.
" 13 : 18–22, III. 99.
" 13 : 23, I. 353.
" 13 : 26, III. 450.
" 13 : 33, II. 257.
" 13 : 34–37, III. 425.
" 13 : 39, II. 386–7, III. 272.
" 13 : 46, I. 356, 389, 416.
" 13 : 50, II. 269.
" 14 : 2, II. 229.
" 14 : 22, I. 600, 633, II. 36, 739, III. 184.
" 15 : 8, III. 65.
" 15 : 11, III. 451.
" 15 : 13–21, I. 409, 439, 589, 594, 687.
" 15 : 16–18, I. 283, 347, II. 51, 72, 74, 76, 179, 200, 204, 206, 470, III. 454, 534.
" 15 : 18, I. 35, 38.
" 16 : 16–18, II. 621.
" 16 : 17, III. 450.
" 17 : 2, I. 117.
" 17 : 3, 4, I. 447, II. 269, III. 288.
" 17 : 6–31, II. 384, 406, 546.
" 17 : 7, III. 571.
" 17 : 11, I. 48, 117, III. 288.
" 17 : 28, III. 342.
" 17 : 30, 31, II. 471, III. 575.
" 17 : 31, I. 447, 563, II. 180. 352–3, 358, 365, III. 419, 541.
" 17 : 32, II. 229.
" 18 : 4, I. 117.
" 18 : 5, III. 579.
" 18 : 28, III. 414.
" 19 : 4, III. 579.
" 19 : 6, III. 65.
" 19 : 13–16, II. 621.
" 19 : 21, I. 416.
" 19 : 27, II. 406, 546.
" 19 : 32, I. 632.
" 20 : 21, III. 579.
" 20 : 25, I. 600.
" 20 : 26, 27, III. 199.
" 20 : 28, I. 632.
" 20 : 29, 30, I. 634, III. 335.
" 20 : 32, I. 132.
" 21 : 20, III. 184.

Ch. 21 : 28, **II.** 67.
" 22 : 3, **II.** 67.
" 22 : 28, **III.** 431.
" 23 : 6–8, **II.** 228–9.
" 24 : 5, **II.** 546.
" 24 : 10, **II.** 355.
" 24 : 25, **II.** 406.
" 25 : 2, **II.** 269.
" 25 : 19, **II.** 267.
" 25 : 31, **II.** 355.
" 26 : 1–23, **I.** 469.
" 26 : 6–8, **I.** 297, 446, **II.** 51, 67, 229, **III.** 310, 395.
" 26 : 16–18, **III.** 192.
" 26 : 18, **II.** 249, 591.
" 26 : 22, 23, **I.** 297.
" 27 : 37, **II.** 266.
" 28 : 7, 17, **II.** 269.
" 28 : 17–31, **I.** 388, 469.
" 28 : 20, **II.** 67, **III.** 310.
" 28 : 25, **III.** 70.
" 28 : 31, **I.** 600, **III.** 579.

ROMANS.

Ch. 1–16, **III.** 361.
" 1 : 3, 4, **I.** 339, 353, 562, **II.** 237, 299, 581.
" 1 : 6, **I.** 416.
" 1 : 8, **III.** 192.
" 1 : 16, **III.** 450.
" 1 : 20, **II.** 480.
" 1 : 25, **II.** 480.
" 2 : 2, **II.** 387.
" 2 : 5, **I.** 466.
" 2 : 6, **II.** 388, 396.
" 2 : 7, **II.** 386.
" 2 : 9, 10, **I.** 416, **II.** 67, 391.
" 2 : 16, **II.** 365, 396, **III.** 575.
" 2 : 28, 29. **I.** 399, 404.
" 3 : 3, **I.** 297, 383.
" 3 : 9, 29, **II.** 67.
" 3 : 22–30, **III.** 272.
" 3 : 28, **III.** 364.
" 4 : 13, **II.** 435, 447, 577.
" 4 : 17, **I.** 415, **II.** 22.
" 4 : 18, **III.** 309, 320.
" 5 : 1, 2, **II.** 386, **III.** 450.
" 5 : 9, 10, **III.** 451, 456.
" 5 : 12, 14, 17, 21, **I.** 589, **II.** 173.
" 5 : 14–21, **III.** 431.
" 5 : 20, **III.** 191.
" 6 : 5, **II.** 229.
" 6 : 9, **II.** 268.
" 6 : 10–13, **II.** 267.
" 6 : 17, **III.** 280.
" 6 : 22, **II.** 386.
" 8 : 1, **II.** 386.
" 8 : 5–16, **II.** 384–5.
" 8 : 6, **II.** 34.
" 8 : 9, **III.** 167.
" 8 : 10, **II.** 307.
" 8 : 11, **I.** 53, **II.** 257–8, 308, 386, 396, **III.** 68.
Ch. 8 : 15, **I.** 403.
" 8 : 17–23, **II.** 376, 395, 492–3, 546, 597, 739.
" 8 : 19–23, **I.** 413, 439, 617, 669, **II.** 182, 229, 258, 270, 397, 479, 480, etc., 484, **III.** 322, 324.
" 8 : 23, **III.** 323.
" 8 : 24, **III.** 450.
" 8 : 28, **III.** 341.
" 8 : 29, **II.** 257.
" 8 : 30, **II.** 34.
" 8 : 31–34, **II.** 386.
" 8 : 38, 39, **II.** 444, 480, 597, 739.
" 9 : 1, **I.** 134.
" 9 : 3–5, **I.** 213, 383.
" 9 : 4, **I.** 209, 398, **II.** 237.
" 9 : 5, **III.** 535.
" 9 : 6, **I.** 399.
" 9 : 9–21, **III.** 340.
" 9 : 10, 11, **I.** 397, 401, **II.** 68, etc., 75, 119.
" 9 : 11, **II.** 207, 209, **III.** 478.
" 9 : 16, 17, **II.** 590.
" 9 : 22, **III.** 435.
" 9 : 23, 24, **I.** 397, **II.** 67, **III.** 342.
" 9 : 27, **II.** 299.
" 9 : 31–33, **I.** 383, 676.
" 10 : 5, **II.** 546.
" 10 : 7, **II.** 308.
" 10 : 8, 10, 12, 21, **I.** 383, **II.** 67, 87, **III.** 284.
" 10 : 9, 10, **III.** 280.
" 10 : 14–17, **I.** 138, **III.** 284.
" 10 : 18, **II.** 406, 546, **III.** 169, 192.
" 11, **I.** 213, 216, 439, **II.** 50, 775, **III.** 191.
" 11 : 7, 23, **II.** 383, 399.
" 11 : 8, 11, 12, **II.** 35.
" 11 : 12–15, **I.** 233, 698, **II.** 142.
" 11 : 15, **III.** 324.
" 11 : 16, 27, **I.** 336.
" 11 : 18, **I.** 659.
" 11 : 20, **I.** 188, 334.
" 11 : 24, **I.** 397.
" 11 : 25–27, **I.** 696, **II.** 51, 76, 79, 142, 189, **III.** 323.
" 11 : 28, 29, **I.** 179, 207, 335, 405, **II.** 53, 95, 590.
" 11 : 30–32, **I.** 420.
" 11 : 33, **I.** 38.
" 11 : 36, **I.** 559.
" 12 : 1, **III.** 89.
" 12 : 2, **I.** 589.
" 12 : 5, **III.** 578.
" 13 : 1–5, **III.** 12.
" 13 : 10, **II.** 70.
" 13 : 11, 12, **I.** 439, 471, 476, **II.** 181, 218, 368, 414, **III.** 96, 107, 159, 450.
" 14 : 4, **III.** 234.
" 14 : 5, 6, **III.** 265.
" 14 : 9–13, **I.** 369, 560, **II.** 269, 271, 353, 357.
" 14 : 10–12, **II.** 180, 384, 387, **III.** 196, 532, 575.

Ch. 14 : 15, I. 134.
" 14 : 17, II. 34–5.
" 14 : 20, II. 105.
" 15 : 1, III. 272.
" 15 : 8, I. 362, 373.
" 15 : 13, III. 309.
" 15 : 16, III. 89.
" 15 : 18, III. 65, 70.
" 15 : 19, I. 92.
" 16 : 12, II. 108.
" 16 : 17, I. 634.
" 16 : 20, II. 142, 582.
" 16 : 25, I. 144.

I. CORINTHIANS.

Ch. 1 : 4–10, III. 324.
" 1 : 5–8, II. 42, 410, III. 241.
" 1 : 7–8, I. 439, 442, II. 169, III. 167, 322–3, 575.
" 1 : 9, I. 332.
" 1 : 20, I. 589.
" 1 : 21, III. 193.
" 1 : 23, III. 574, 579.
" 1 : 25–28, I. 8, 417, 550, II. 95, III. 342.
" 2 : 2, III. 579.
" 2 : 7–10, I. 36, 144, II. 585.
" 2 : 8, I. 283, 589.
" 2 : 12, 13, I. 77, 133.
" 2 : 14, I. 139.
" 2 : 17, I. 52, 74, 332.
" 2 : 41, I. 70.
" 3 : 8–15, II. 592.
" 3 : 9, III. 57.
" 3 : 10–15, II. 384, 389, etc., 591, III. 274.
" 3 : 11, III. 578.
" 3 : 13, III. 82.
" 3 : 16, III. 90.
" 3 : 17, II. 258.
" 3 : 18, I. 14, 59, 62.
" 3 : 21–23, II. 444.
" 4 : 3, 5, II. 412.
" 4 : 5, 8, I. 439, 589, II. 384, 573, III. 323–4.
" 4 : 9, II. 619.
" 4 : 14, II. 229.
" 4 : 20, I. 659, II. 37.
" 5, III. 81.
" 5 : 5, II. 366, 410, III. 452.
" 6 : 1, III. 193.
" 6 : 2, 3, I. 589, II. 385, 392, 583, 620.
" 6 : 3, 9, 14, I. 102, 600, 439, II. 229, 299, 376.
" 7 : 8. I. 442.
" 7 : 29–31, I. 476, 589, II. 431.
" 8 : 6, I. 559.
" 8 : 12, I. 134.
" 8 : 15, II. 81, 89.
" 9 : 24, II. 390.
" 9 : 25, II. 579.
" 10 : 2, 4, I. 608.
" 10 : 11, I. 212, 476, II. 336, 420, 425.
Ch. 10 : 28, 29, I. 134.
" 10 : 33, III. 452.
" 11 : 3, I. 597.
" 11 : 10, II. 619.
" 11 : 13, I. 634.
" 11 : 17–19, III. 335.
" 11 : 26, I. 331, III. 60, 132, 323.
" 11 : 30, III. 431.
" 11 : 32, I. 589, III. 186.
" 12 : 7–11, I. 92, 119, III. 64.
" 12 : 8, 9. III. 272.
" 12 : 27, III. 578.
" 13, I. 333. III. 122, 144, 274.
" 13 : 1–3, I. 67, 151.
" 13 : 1–13, III. 234.
" 13 : 8, 13, III. 73, 176.
" 13 : 9, I. 193.
" 13 : 12, II. 351.
" 15, II. 397.
" 15 : 2, 12, I. 415, II. 234, III. 452.
" 15 : 12, 21, II. 299.
" 15 : 19, III. 184.
" 15 : 20, II. 229, 477.
" 15 : 21, 22, II. 229, 363, III. 575.
" 15 : 23, 24, I. 633, 675, 681, 683, II. 211, 229, 247, 265, 295, 299, 301–2, 630, III. 324, 558.
" 15 : 24–26, I. 39, 248, 563, II. 344, 471, 630.
" 15 : 27, 28, I. 447, 579, II. 634, III. 431.
" 15 : 32, II. 227.
" 15 : 34, I. 133.
" 15 : 38, II. 391.
" 15 : 40, III. 57.
" 15 : 41, II. 387, 591, III. 57.
" 15 : 42–44, 51–54, II. 46, 154, 229, 231, 299.
" 15 : 45–55, I. 315, II. 258.
" 15 : 47, I. 573.
" 15 : 49, II. 477.
" 15 : 50, I. 602, II. 477.
" 15 : 51, 52, 55, II. 172, 190, 229, 291, 295, 301, 314, 318, 320, 324, 560, III. 159.
" 15 : 54, 55, I. 685, II. 402, 543, III. 185, 190, 245.
" 16 : 17, II. 211.
16 : 22, II. 198, 333.

II. CORINTHIANS.

Ch. 1 : 5, I. 617.
" 1 : 8, II. 365.
" 1 : 14, I. 439 II. 212, 410.
" 1 : 21, III. 578.
" 1 : 22, III. 67.
" 2 : 14–16, II. 20, 229.
" 2 : 16, I. 53.
" 3 : 6, I. 53, 332.
" 3 : 7, 8, III. 72–3.
" 3 : 16, I. 75, 439.
" 3 : 18, II. 477.
" 4 : 3, III. 193.
" 4 : 4, III. 188.

Ch. 4 : 5, 8, I. 439, III. 579.
" 4 : 7, I. 8.
" 4 : 14, I. 53. 332, II. 229, 240.
" 4 : 17, 18, II. 597.
" 4 : 18, I. 589.
" 5 : 1–18, II. 240.
" 5 : 2, II. 14, III. 323.
" 5 : 5, I. 332, III. 67.
" 5 : 9–21, II. 363, 384, 392, 401.
" 5 : 10, II. 355, 388.
" 5 : 15, III. 68, 431.
" 5 : 16, III. 324.
" 5 : 17, II. 514.
" 6 : 2, II. 365.
" 6 : 16, III. 90, 590.
" 7 : 6, 7, II. 211.
" 9 : 6, II. 391.
" 9 : 8, II. 390.
" 10 : 5, I. 560.
" 10 : 10, II. 211.
" 11 : 2, 3, II. 132, III. 40.
" 11 : 13, III. 193.
" 13 : 4, II. 267.

GALATIANS.

Ch. 1 : 4, I. 439, 589, II. 425, III. 184, 454.
" 1 : 8, I. 116.
" 1 : 23, I. 138.
" 2 : 4, I. 132.
" 2 : 16, II. 386.
" 2 : 20, I. 632, III. 272.
" 3 : 1, II. 194.
" 3 : 7, I. 396.
" 3 : 8, I. 334, 383, 608.
" 3 : 16, I. 302–3, 307, 320, 325, 439.
" 3 : 16–18, II. 396, 447.
" 3 : 17, I. 305, 325.
" 3 : 19, II. 619.
" 3 : 29, I. 305.
" 4, III. 44.
" 4 : 5, 6, 7, I. 321, 403.
" 4 : 10, III. 265.
" 4 : 17, I. 53.
" 4 : 24, I. 50, 64–5.
" 4 : 26, I. 283; II. 528, III. 48.
" 4 : 27, II. 132.
" 5 : 1–6, III. 88.
" 5 : 14, II. 70.
" 5 : 21, I. 601.
" 5 : 22, III. 272.
" 6 : 7, II. 388.
" 6 : 9, II. 391.
" 6 : 15, II. 514.

EPHESIANS.

Ch. 1, I. 401.
" 1 : 3, II. 12, 580.
" 1 : 4, 5, I. 34, 40, 401, 403, 413.
" 1 : 4–12, III. 342.
" 1 : 7, I. 632, II. 421, 451, 580.
" 1 : 8, 9, I. 38, 141.
" 1 : 10–12, II. 225, 276, 425
" 1 : 10–21, I. 439, 590, II. 13, 618
Ch. 1 : 13, II. 258, III. 68, 450.
" 1 : 14, II. 241, 479. 534, III. 67, 450.
" 1 : 15, 16, I. 119, II. 249.
" 1 : 18, III. 309.
" 1 : 20, II. 308.
" 1 : 21–23, I. 40, 563, 596, II. 38, 421.
" 1 : 23, II. 582, 588, III. 578.
" 2, 3, I. 398.
" 2 : 2, I. 589, III. 189.
" 2 : 7, II. 408.
" 2 : 10, II. 390, III. 342.
" 2 : 12–19, I. 333, 439.
" 2 : 16, III. 456.
" 2 : 19–22, III. 57, 432.
" 2 : 20, 21, I. 126, 338, 608, 659, 683.
" 3, I. 230.
" 3 : 2, I. 590.
" 3 : 3, I. 141.
" 3 : 4–6, I. 77, 151, 405, II. 23.
" 3 : 7, III. 272.
" 3 : 9–11, III. 342.
" 3 : 10, 11, I. 36, 38, II. 12, 408, 580, 618.
" 3 : 13, I. 617.
" 3 : 20, I. 92.
" 3 : 21, II. 421, 551.
" 4 : 12, III. 578.
" 4 : 20, II. 183.
" 4 : 30, I. 439, II. 154, 229, 241.
" 5 : 5, I. 601, III. 530.
" 5 : 23–30, I. 632, II. 28, III. 40, 431.
" 5 : 24, I. 597.
" 5 : 27, II. 132.
" 6 : 2, 3, II. 442.
" 6 : 8, II. 388.
" 6 : 12, II. 12, 580, III. 188–9.
" 6 : 17, I. 118.

PHILIPPIANS.

Ch. 1 : 6–10, I. 439, 442, II. 42, 169, 183, 412, III. 324.
" 1 : 8, 28, 29, II. 739.
" 1 : 9–11, I. 117, 132, III. 324.
" 1 : 20–25, I. 474, II. 401.
" 1 : 26, II. 211.
" 1 : 27, 29, III. 450.
" 2 : 3, II. 211.
" 2 : 6–11, I. 369, 581, III. 478.
" 2 : 10–16, I. 439, 442, 559, 560, II. 180, 410, III. 479.
" 2 : 11, II. 180, 259, 300, III. 532, 535.
" 2 : 12, II. 390, III. 450.
" 2 : 13, III. 342.
" 2 : 17, III. 89.
" 3 : 3, I. 404.
" 3 : 10–21, I. 53, 92, 442, 536, II. 229, 232.
" 3 : 8–11, II. 265, 308.
" 3 : 11, II. 239, 253, 283, 298, 307.
" 3 : 14, II. 390.
" 3 : 20, 21, I. 589, II. 14, 258, 344, 395, 477, 560, 616, III. 100, 103, 315, 322, 324, 457, 575.

Ch. 4 : 3, II. 387.
" 4 : 5, I. 471, 476, II. 218, 344, III. 324.
" 4 : 18, III. 89.
" 4 : 19, III. 578.

COLOSSIANS.

Ch. 1 : 5, II. 14.
" 1 : 6, III. 117, 169, 192.
" 1 : 9–11, I. 132, II. 13.
" 1 : 12, II. 249, 256.
" 1 : 13, II. 35, III. 188.
" 1 : 15–19, I. 559, II. 257, 477, III. 447–8, 530.
" 1 : 16, II. 618, III. 532.
" 1 : 17, III. 479, 532.
" 1 : 22, II. 391.
" 1 : 23, II. 492.
" 1 : 24, I. 617.
" 1 : 26, 27, II. 23, III. 309, 310.
" 1 : 28, II. 384.
" 2 : 4, III. 100.
" 2 : 5–7, III. 272.
" 2 : 8, I. 132.
" 2 : 9, III. 478, 530.
" 2 : 13, II. 393.
" 2 : 16, 17, II. 454, III. 265–6.
" 3 : 1–4, III. 324.
" 3 : 4, 5, II. 177, 344, 560, III. 100, 322, 575.
" 3 : 4–24, II. 376, 387, 390, 395–6.
" 3 : 12, I. 401.
" 4 : 11, I. 600.

I. THESSALONIANS.

Ch. 1 : 2, 3, III. 309.
" 1 : 4, I. 401.
" 1 : 5, I. 413, 447, II. 209.
" 1 : 9, 10, III. 323.
" 1 : 10, III. 319, 322–3.
" 1 : 12, III. 310.
" 2 : 12, I. 414, 600, 659, II. 38, 376.
" 2 : 19, 20, II. 209, 211, 384, III. 313, 323, 575.
" 3 : 3, II. 739, III. 184.
" 3 : 12, 13, II. 390, III. 323–4, 575
" 3 : 13, II. 175, 209, 297, 318.
" 3 : 14–17, II. 318.
" 4 : 8, III. 193.
" 4 : 11, I. 473.
" 4 : 13–17, II. 240, 318, 378, 407, III. 323.
" 4 : 14, 16, II. 154, 175, 373.
" 4 : 15–17, I. 474, 478, 536, II. 172, 190, 209, 211, 218, 229, 233, 247, 282, 291, 295, 299, 302–3, 314, 341, 397, 560, 576, 741.
" 4 : 16, III. 59.
" 4 : 17, III. 159, 323.
" 5, I. 420.
" 5 : 1–8, III. 26, 108, 250, 323.
" 5 : 2, 3, II. 105, 186, 318, 365, 410, 739.
" 5 : 2, 23, I. 440, III. 42, 209, 211.
Ch. 5 : 4–9, I. 186, III. 323.
" 5 : 5, 6, I. 170, III. 100.
" 5 : 8, 9, III. 450, 595.
" 5 : 21, I. 133, III. 288.
" 5 : 23, III. 324.

II. THESSALONIANS.

Ch. 1, 2, I. 439, II. 104, 165, 170, 184, 208, etc., 210, 302.
" 1 : 1, 2, III. 575.
" 1 : 4, 5, II. 739.
" 1 : 5–11, I. 414, 600, 617, 619, 659, 739, II. 105, 240, 374, 376, III. 28, 81, 323, 396, 450.
" 1 : 6–10, II. 384.
" 1 : 7–9, II. 169, 171, 174, 176–9, 324, 396, 454, 462, III. 323, 396.
" 1 : 8, II. 508.
" 1 : 9, III. 400.
" 1 : 10, II. 590, III. 323, 452.
" 2, II. 689, etc., 698, 707, 712, 713, 718, 747, III. 117, 119, 215, 323,
" 2 : 1, I. 412, II. 171, 177, 187, 209, 221, 408, 576, 762, III. 60.
" 2 : 1, 8, 9, II. 211, 519.
" 2 : 1–14, III. 183, 250, 323.
" 2 : 2, I. 473, 492, II. 316, 410, III. 60.
" 2 : 2, 3, II. 324.
" 2 : 3–12, II. 216, 741.
" 2 : 4, II. 696.
" 2 : 5, 6, I. 171, II. 668, III. 250.
" 2 : 6, 7, II. 701, etc.
" 2 : 7, II. 328, 766–7, 772, III. 324.
" 2 : 8, II. 87, 105, 171, 186, 212, 220, III. 113, 179, 186, 245.
" 2 : 8, 10–12, II. 154, 169, 217, 721, III. 193.
" 2 : 9, II. 740, 758, III. 161, 164.
" 2 : 13, III. 451.
" 2 : 17, II. 390.
" 3 : 5, I. 414, II. 209, III. 323.
" 3 : 10, I. 473.
" 3 : 14, I. 132.

I. TIMOTHY.

Ch. 1 : 3, 4, I. 112.
" 1 : 3–10, I. 133
" 1 : 15, II. 269.
" 1 : 17, II. 411, 631
" 2 : 4, III. 451.
" 2 : 12, II. 436, 444, 577.
" 2 : 16, II. 471.
" 2 : 21, II. 390.
" 3 : 1, II. 413.
" 3 : 15, III. 56.
" 3 : 16, II. 390, III. 478.
" 4 : 1–3, I. 134, II. 338, 374, 384, 392, III. 123, 175, 193, 203, 323.
" 4 : 6, III. 241.
" 4 : 8, II. 395–6, 418, 579, 582, 585.
" 4 : 10, III. 193.
" 4 : 13–16, I. 112, III. 324.
" 4 : 16, III. 451.

Ch. 5 : 21, I. 402, II. 619.
" 5 : 23, I. 72.
" 5 : 24, II. 384.
" 6 : 3, 4, I. 133.
" 6 : 14, II. 211, 476, III. 100, 324.
" 6 : 15, II. 412.
" 6 : 16, II. 237.

II. TIMOTHY.

Ch. 1 : 1, III. 310.
" 1 : 7, II. 471.
" 1 : 8, II. 617.
" 1 : 10, II. 211.
" 1 : 15, II. 379.
" 1 : 16, II. 89.
" 2 : 2, I. 640.
" 2 : 8, I. 354.
" 2 : 10, III. 193, 450–1.
" 2 : 12, II. 36, III. 323.
" 2 : 15, I. 67, II. 146.
" 2 : 17, 18, II. 218, 229, 234.
" 2 : 20, II. 87.
" 3 : 1–13, I. 132, II. 105, 186, 218, 367, 758, III. 124, 134, 175, 185, 203, 209, 323–4.
" 3 : 5, III. 193.
" 3 : 11, 12, III. 184, 193.
" 3 : 12, II. 739.
" 3 : 14–17, I. 70, 74, 116, 117, 132, 161, 163, III. 328, 451.
" 4 : 1, I. 224, 268, 414, 470, II. 25, 41, 105, 177, 211, 227, 355, 365.
" 4 : 1–5, III. 147, 185, 193, 241.
" 4 : 1, 2, 8, III. 100, 314, 315, 322.
" 4 : 3, 4, I. 491–2, 634, II. 105, III. 120, 335.
" 4 : 6, II. 733.
" 4 : 8, II. 14, 211, 332, III. 323.
" 4 : 10, I. 589.
" 4 : 18, I. 600.

TITUS.

Ch. 1 : 2, I. 179.
" 1 : 3, III. 478.
" 1 : 5, I. 134.
" 2 : 11–13, II. 344, 390, III. 100, 103, 110, 113, 322, 323–4, 451, 575.
" 2 : 13, I. 471, 577, 692, II. 14, 211, 322, 388, III. 534, 541.
" 2 : 14, II. 140, III. 431.
" 3 : 5, 6, II. 478, III. 73.
" 3 : 8, II. 390.

HEBREWS.

Ch. 1 : 1, 2, I. 446, II. 201, 338, 411, 421, 423, 425, III. 69, 478, 532.
" 1 : 3, III. 479, 530.
" 1 : 4, II. 618.
" 1 : 5, 6, I. 313, II. 183, 257, 406, 546, 618, III. 479.
" 1 : 7, II. 578.
" 1 : 8, II. 346, 631, 637, III. 478.
Ch. 4 : 10–12, II. 519.
" 1 : 12, II. 195, 367.
" 1 : 12–17, II. 752.
" 1 : 13, II. 109.
" 1 : 14, II. 619, III. 451.
" 1 : 16, I. 34.
" 1 : 17, II. 388.
" 2, II. 486.
" 2 : 2, II. 619.
" 2 : 3–5, III. 451.
" 2 : 4, I. 92, II. 758, III. 65, 70.
" 2 : 5–9, I. 440, II. 346, 405, 437, 598, 620–1.
" 2 : 6, 7, I. 572, 574, 614.
" 2 : 8, II. 142.
" 2 : 9–11, II. 612, 613.
" 2 : 12, II. 376.
" 2 : 14, II. 562, III. 363.
" 2 : 16, 17, II. 604, III. 363.
" 3 : 2, 5, 6, III. 57.
" 3 : 6, II. 582, III. 311.
" 3 : 7, I. 70, II. 365.
" 3 : 8, II. 365, 527.
" 3 : 11–18, II. 454.
" 3 : 12, III. 280.
" 4 : 1–11, II. 368, 454.
" 4 : 2, I. 335.
" 4 : 3, I. 34, 440.
" 4 : 9, I. 440, II. 453, 455.
" 4 : 14, I. 562.
" 4 : 15, II. 612.
" 5 : 6, 10, II. 601, 612.
" 5 : 12, I. 151.
" 5 : 14, 117.
" 6 : 2, II. 299.
" 6 : 5, II. 405.
" 6 : 10, II. 376, 391, 601.
" 6 : 13, 14, II. 137.
" 6 : 17–19, I. 177, III. 311.
" 6 : 18, I. 179.
" 7, I. 50.
" 7 : 14, II. 604, III. 363.
" 7 : 15, 16, II. 603.
" 7 : 18, 22, I. 326.
" 7 : 21–25, II. 601, 603.
" 7 : 22–27, III. 83.
" 8 : 1, II. 602.
" 8 : 2, II. 603.
" 8 : 5, II. 568.
" 8 : 6, I. 326.
" 8 : 8, I. 293, 326.
" 8 : 10, III. 590.
" 8 : 13, I. 322.
" 8 : 27, III. 458.
" 9 : 1, III. 284.
" 9 : 2, 3, I. 668.
" 9 : 8, 9, I. 70, 295, III. 83.
" 9 : 9–13, II. 447, 603, III. 458.
" 9 : 12, II. 603.
" 9 : 14, I. 134, II. 603–4.
" 9 : 15–17, II. 322, 331, III. 458.
" 9 : 16, II. 293.
" 9 : 22, III. 431.

Ch. 9 : 23, III. 459.
" 9 : 24, III. 61.
" 9 : 26, II. 425.
" 9 : 27, 28, II. 385, III. 60, 323.
" 9 : 28, I. 323, 440, II. 142, 154, 181, 221, 332, III. 90, 160, 449.
" 10 : 1, II. 568, III. 83.
" 10 : 1–18, III. 83.
" 10 : 5, II. 546.
" 10 : 10–22, III. 458.
" 10 : 12, 13, I. 578, III. 363.
" 10 : 15, I. 70, II. 471, III. 68.
" 10 : 17, II. 393.
" 10 : 22, I. 415.
" 10 : 25–37, I. 440, 471, 476, II. 14, 191, 218, 508, III. 107, 458.
" 10 : 26, III. 459.
" 10 : 36, 37, II. 344, III. 107, 324.
" 10 : 38, 39, III. 284.
" 11 : 3, II. 406.
" 11 : 5, II. 425.
" 11 : 8–16, I. 309.
" 11 : 10, 11, I. 296, III. 46.
" 11 : 13, 40, I. 295, 301, 413.
" 11 : 16, I. 295.
" 11 : 17–19, I. 296, 310.
" 11 : 19, II. 229.
" 11 : 27, I. 137.
" 11 : 28, III. 100.
" 11 : 35, II. 261, 266, 292, 307.
" 11 : 39, 40, II. 396.
" 11 : 46, II. 249.
" 12 : 1–13, II. 612, III. 341.
" 12 : 2, I. 369, 560, 582.
" 12 : 3–4, III. 363.
" 12 : 5–12, I. 417.
" 12 : 22–28, I. 415, 600, 615, II. 13, 240, 446, 494, 618, 620, III. 42, 44, 46, 48.
" 12 : 23, II. 387, 609.
" 12 : 29, III. 81.
" 12 : 35, II. 169.
" 13 : 8, II. 603, III. 532.
" 13 : 12, III, 431.
" 13 : 14, I. 589.
" 13 : 15, 16, II. 611, III. 89.
" 13 : 17, II. 384.
" 13 : 18, III. 478.
" 13 : 20, 21, II. 308, 390, III. 458.

JAMES.

Ch. 1 : 1, II. 67.
" 1 : 2–4, II. 612.
" 1 : 5, I. 117, 119.
" 1 : 12, I. 411, II. 577, III. 450.
" 1 : 17, I. 179.
" 1 : 18, II. 319, III. 185.
" 1 : 21, III. 327.
" 2 : 1, 5, 23, III. 364.
" 2 : 5, I. 401, 600, II. 376, 577, III. 310, 450.
" 2 : 14–26, III. 364.
" 5 : 1–3, III. 129.
" 5 : 3, 8, I. 415, 476, II. 423.
Ch. 5 : 7, 8, 9, II. 211, 218, 221, 344, 397, 421, III. 324, 450.

I. PETER.

Ch. 1 : 1, 2, I. 401, III. 169.
" 1 : 2–13, I. 413, III. 183.
" 1 : 3, II. 299.
" 1 : 3, 7, 13, II. 396, 739, III. 451.
" 1 : 3, 21, II. 308.
" 1 : 4, 5, 7, 13, II. 531, III. 450.
" 1 : 4–6, I. 446, II. 14, 447, 739.
" 1 : 5, 20, II. 423, III, 147.
" 1 : 7–15, I. 597, 617, II. 177, 388, 390, 395, 513, 612, III. 323–4, 575.
" 1 : 9, I. 415.
" 1 : 10, 12, I. 169, 440, 608, III. 313.
" 1 : 11, I. 70, 283, II. 390.
" 1 : 12, I. 177, II. 618, III. 65, 447.
" 1 : 13, III. 100, 311.
" 1 : 16, II. 344.
" 1 : 17, II. 387.
" 1 : 20, I. 34, 446, II. 195, 224, 338, 367.
" 1 : 21, I. 584.
" 1 : 24, 25, II. 260.
" 2 : 2, I. 117.
" 2 : 4–10, II. 57.
" 2 : 5–8, I. 676, 683, II. 577, 607–8, 611, III. 89, 431–2.
" 2 : 9, 10, I. 393, 401, II. 140.
" 2 : 13, III. 12.
" 3 : 18, I. 53, 332, II. 233, 257–8, III. 68.
" 3 : 20, II. 266.
" 3 : 22, II. 618.
" 4 : 4, 5, II. 385, 392.
" 4 : 7, I. 471, 476, 692, II. 218, III. 168, 182, 323.
" 4 : 9, II. 739.
" 4 : 11, I. 126.
" 4 : 12, 13, II. 388, 395, 513, 592, 597, 739, III. 324, 450.
" 4 : 17, III. 57.
" 5 : 1–4, III. 323–4, 450.
" 5 : 4, II. 396, 579, III. 100, 388.

II. PETER.

Ch. 1 : 4, II. 492, III. 432.
" 1 : 9, II. 415.
" 1 : 10, I. 401, 413.
" 1 : 11, I. 171, 414, 600, II. 120, 169, 177, 196, 211, 374, 376, 560, 631, III. 56, 310.
" 1 : 16, II. 169, 196, 211, III. 534.
" 1 : 16–18, II. 559, 560, III. 534.
" 1 : 19, I. 116–7, 161, II. 775.
" 1 : 21, I. 70, 74, 163, 173.
" 2 : 1, 2, I. 134.
" 2 : 4, II. 584, 621.
" 2 : 9, II. 324–5.
" 3, II. 428, 495.
" 3 : 1–14, III. 183.

Ch. 3 : 3, 4, I. 84, 476, II. 186, 337, 367, 423, 431, 480, III. 114, 115, 147, 175, 203.
" 3 : 4–12, II. 211.
" 3 : 5, III. 392.
" 3 : 7, 8, II. 236, 367.
" 3 : 7–12, II. 384, 390, 471.
" 3 : 8, I. 240, II. 366, 368, III. 92, 97.
" 3 : 9, I. 414, III. 96.
" 3 : 10–13, I. 415, 477, 686, II. 169, 178, 219, 410, 506, etc., 513, 514, 524, 560.
" 3 : 11, 12, III. 314, 323–4.
" 3 : 12, II. 370, III. 100, 103, 309.
" 3 : 13, II. 396, 446,, 479, 492, 499, 500, 502, III. 42, 315, 324.
" 3 : 14, III. 324.
" 3 : 16, I. 151.
" 3 : 17, III. 165.
" 4 : 4, 5, II. 385.
" 4 : 12, 13, I. 617.

I. JOHN.

Ch. 1 : 3, II. 615.
" 1 : 5, II. 775.
" 1 : 18, III. 185–6, 532.
" 2 : 8, II. 344, 390, III. 575.
" 2 : 15, 17, I. 589, II. 431, III. 170.
" 2 : 18, I. 446, 476, II. 195, 211, 301, 337, 423, 668, 697.
" 2 : 20, 27, III. 578.
" 2 : 22, II. 696, 698, 741, III. 513, 576.
" 2 : 23, III. 532.
" 2 : 28, II. 384, 391, III. 324, 450.
" 3 : 1–3, I. 403, 536, II. 14, 229, 334, 395, 477, 560, III. 450, 457.
" 3 : 8, I. 562, II. 537, III. 454.
" 3 : 23, III. 284.
" 4 : 1, 2, I. 134, 570.
" 4 : 3, II. 698.
" 4 : 15, III. 478.
" 4 : 17, II. 384, 390.
" 5 : 1, III. 571.
" 5 : 9, III. 184.
" 5 : 19, III. 186, 188.
" 5 : 20, III. 478.
" 5 : 21, II. 749.

II. JOHN.

Verse 1, 13, I. 402.
" 7, I. 570, 698.
" 8, II. 391, 591.
" 9–11, I. 112, 132.

JUDE.

Verse 3, 14, 21, 24, III. 451.
" 6, II. 584, 621.
" 9, II. 562, 621.
" 14–16, I. 608, II. 175, 186, 198, 318, 578, 766, III. 81, 323.
" 18, 19, II. 105, 423.

REVELATION.

Ch. 1–22, III. 366.
" 1 : 1, I. 476, II. 619, III. 374.
" 1 : 3, I. 170, 173, II. 733, III. 108, 167, 386.
" 1 : 4–8, II. 185, III. 379.
" 1 : 5, 6, I. 559, II. 257, 577–8, 581, 607, III. 431.
" 1 : 6–9, II. 415, 589, III. 27.
" 1 : 7, II. 178, 187, III. 186, 190, 323, 377, 384.
" 1 : 8, I. 300.
" 1 : 9, II. 36.
" 1 : 10, III. 95.
" 1 : 13, 17, III. 379, 393.
" 1 : 17, I. 536, III. 478.
" 1 : 18, II. 320.
" 1 : 20, III. 379.
" 2 : 7, II. 386, III. 419.
" 2 : 7, 11, 17, 29, III. 379.
" 2 : 8, II. 267, 271.
" 2 : 10, II. 396, 579.
" 2 : 11, I. 476.
" 2 : 23, II. 388, III. 478.
" 2 : 25, III. 324.
" 2 : 26, 27, I. 536, 589, II. 104, 179, 318, 359, 578, 753, III. 28, 81, 189, 396.
" 3 : 1, III. 73.
" 3 : 3, II. 318, III. 324.
" 3 : 5, II. 384, 619.
" 3 : 6, 13, 22, III. 379.
" 3 : 7, 8, II. 351, 615. III. 205.
" 3 : 8–13, III. 479, 532, 579.
" 3 : 10, II. 323, 406, 546.
" 3 : 11, I. 210, II. 528, 591, III. 324.
" 3 : 12, II. 473, 528, 580, III. 48, 90.
" 3 : 14, III. 478.
" 3 : 17, III. 129.
" 3 : 19, I. 417.
" 3 : 20, III. 284.
" 3 : 21, I. 349, 563, 589, II. 177, 204, 355, 357, 374, 577, 602,
" 4 : 1, 2, III. 25.
" 4 : 4, II. 579.
" 4 : 7, II. 320.
" 4 : 8, II. 185.
" 4 : 11, II. 437.
" 5 : 5, I. 351.
" 5 : 6, I. 615, II. 320, III. 73.
" 5 : 9–14, II. 300, III. 431.
" 5 : 10, II. 446, 573, 577, 581, 607, III. 324.
" 5 : 11, 12, II. 618, 619.
" 5 : 13, III. 535.
" 6, II. 686, 742, III. 186.
" 6 : 9–11, I. 413, II. 397.
" 6 : 10, 11, III. 186.
" 6 : 13–17, I. 446, II. 165, 195, III. 25.
" 6 : 14, II. 12.
" 6 : 15, 16, III. 395.
" 7, II. 323.
" 7 : 4–9, I. 404.

Ch. 7 : 9–17, II. 282, III. 535.
" 7 : 13, III. 590.
" 7 : 14, II. 738.
" 7 : 15–17, II. 615, III. 90.
" 7 : 17, III. 389.
" 8 : 9, III. 160.
" 8 : 13, II. 320.
" 9 : 1, 2, II. 706.
" 9 : 11, II. 618.
" 9 : 18, I. 446.
" 9 : 20, 21, II. 748, III. 161.
" 10 : 6, II. 411.
" 10 : 7, I. 105, 144, 152, II. 183, 190, III. 18, 104, 186, 459.
" 11, II. 357, 706.
" 11 : 3–7, II. 739, III. 99.
" 11 : 8, II. 290.
" 11 : 13–18, II. 497, 516.
" 11 : 15–18, I. 208, 439, 466, 577, II. 33, 109, 117, 121, 170, 179, 183, 187, 200, 295, 436, 499, 516, 631, 636, 658, 779, III. 16, 56, 104, 185–6, 382, 530, 555, 575.
" 11 : 14, II. 715.
" 11 : 17, II. 185, 300.
" 11 : 18, II. 264, 285, 396, 759, III. 189, 245, 396–7, 576.
" 11 : 19, III. 459.
" 12 : 5, II. 285.
" 12 : 6–14, III. 99.
" 12 : 7–9, II. 12, 406, 546, III. 25.
" 12 : 10, III. 16, 396.
" 13, II. 687, 712, 715, 717, 738.
" 13 : 1, II. 527.
" 13 : 1–10, II. 705.
" 13 : 2, II. 704, 758.
" 13 : 3, 4, II. 644, 696, 698, 704, 706, 823, 751.
" 13 : 4, 8, 12, II. 698, III. 161.
" 13 : 5–8, I. 34, 300, II. 106, 698, 707, 733, 739.
" 13 : 7, II. 698, 723, 758, 765.
" 13 : 8, II. 387.
" 13 : 11–18, II. 702.
" 13 : 14, II. 267, 746, III. 161.
" 13 : 15–17, II. 268, 300, 664, 698.
" 13 : 18, III. 99.
" 14, II. 322, 327, 335, 700, 715, 717, 720, 740, 746, III. 160, 163, 186, 264.
" 14 : 1, II. 187.
" 14 : 1–5, II. 285, 315, 658.
" 14 : 3, II. 616.
" 14 : 6, 7, II. 705, 745.
" 14 : 6–12, II. 757.
" 14 : 7, II. 323.
" 14 : 8, II. 741, III. 120, 142.
" 14 : 9–13, II. 176, 177, 179, 286, 322, 483, 664–5, 686, 698, 705, 715, 738, 745, III. 161, 189.
" 14 : 14–20, II. 167, 175, 180, 187, 222, 407, 576, 767, III. 185.
" 14 : 18, III. 81.
" 14 : 19, 20, II. 106, 377, 408, 654, 761–2.
Ch. 14 : 20, III. 23.
" 15, II. 143, 286, 717.
" 15 : 2, II. 616, 740, 760, 762, III. 372.
" 15 : 3, I. 597, II. 226, 772.
" 15 : 3, 4, II. 300, 548, 740, 762, III. 185–6, 372.
" 15 : 6, III. 535.
" 15 : 15–19, I. 673.
" 16, II. 742.
" 16 : 1, 2, II. 715.
" 16 : 2, II. 742.
" 16 : 2, 6, II. 286, 740, 756, 760, III. 372.
" 16 : 4, II. 618.
" 16 : 5, II. 185.
" 16 : 12, II. 764, III. 27.
" 16 : 13–16, II. 374, 703–4, 706, 751, 753, 760.
" 16 : 14, II. 106, 181, 406, 546, 765, 768, III. 27, 161.
" 16 : 15, II. 176, 186, 322, 331, 739, III. 323.
" 16 : 16, II. 105, 181, 686, 761–2.
" 16 : 18–21, II. 495, 686.
" 16 : 19, II. 742.
" 17, II. 683, etc., 704–5, 707, 712, 717, 755–6.
" 17 : 4, 16, III. 12.
" 17 : 8, I. 34, II. 723.
" 17 : 9–12, II. 643–4.
" 17 : 10–14, II. 738, 751, 758.
" 17 : 11, II. 698, 705–6.
" 17 : 12–24, I. 681, II. 664, 752.
" 17 : 14, II. 578, 698, 767.
" 17 : 15, 16, II. 707, 742, III. 120, 142, 161.
" 17 : 17, I. 177, II. 742, 754.
" 17 : 19, II. 696.
" 18 : 15–18, II. 742.
" 19, I. 268, 394, 579, II. 106, 109, 208, 222, 345, 742–3, 753, 771, III. 191, 596.
" 19 : 20, I. 438, II. 168, 170, 286.
" 19 : 2, II. 104.
" 19 : 5, 6, III. 555.
" 19 : 7–9, II. 132, 171, 173, 183, 270, 346, 527.
" 19 : 9, III. 45.
" 19 : 10, I. 169.
" 19 : 11–29, I. 249, 283, 536, 672, II. 105, 175, 180, 220, 378–9, 519, 576, 759, 766, III. 323, 382.
" 19 : 12, III. 189.
" 19 : 13, I. 110.
" 19 : 14, II. 318, III. 81.
" 19 : 15, II. 714, III. 189, 190, 372.
" 19 : 15–21, II. 751, 753, 767.
" 19 : 16, II. 578.
" 19 : 17–20, II. 108, 120, 177, 374, 377, 740, III. 372, 389, 394.
" 19 : 18, 19, III. 23, 27, 185, 189.
" 19 : 19, 20, I. 681, II. 181, 270, 483, 664–5, 702, 765, 775, III. 121, 161, 245.
" 19 : 20, III. 394.
" 19 : 21, III. 400.

Ch. 20, **II.** 370.
" 20 : 1–6, **I.** 454, 459, 466, 488, **II.** 142, 149, 152, 173, 177, 247, 249, 264, etc , 285–6, 288, 291, 293, 295, 299, 307, 315, 319, 528, 583, 607–8, 628, 704–5, **III.** 324, 371, 382, 599.
" 20: 4–6, **I.** 439, 589, 673, **II.** 323, 330, 344, 376, 397, 575, 733, 738, **III.** 17, 160, 243, 245, 324, 575.
" 20 : 4, **II.** 572.
" 20 : 5, **II.** 247, **III.** 262.
" 20 : 9, **III.** 47.
" 20 : 10, **II.** 377, **III.** 245.
" 20 : 11–15, **II.** 190, 272, 280, 283, 290, 307, 362, 374.
" 20: 13, 14, **II.** 402, 492, 547.
" 21, 22, **I.** 246, **II.** 145, 378, 499, etc.
" 21 : 1, **I.** 686, **II.** 396, 446, 500, 502, 524, etc., **III.** 42, 324.
" 21 : 2, **I.** 283, **II.** 14, **III.** 43, 50.
" 21 : 2, 5, **II.** 473, 493.
" 21 : 3, **III.** 534, 591.
Ch. 21 : 4, **I.** 33, 300, **III.** 190.
" 21 : 7, 8, **II.** 384, 528, **III.** 284.
" 21 : 10, **III.** 324.
" 21 : 12, **I.** 404, **III.** 88.
" 21 : 14, **II.** 585, **III.** 271.
" 21 : 16, **III.** 47.
" 21 : 22, **III.** 44, 90.
" 21 : 23, **II.** 528, **III.** 393.
" 21 : 24–27, **III.** 44, 596.
" 22 : 1, 2, **II.** 529, **III.** 50.
" 22 : 2–5, 9, 14, 19, **III.** 44.
" 22 : 5, **II.** 444.
" 22 : 7–12, **I.** 471, 476, 692, **III.** 323, 384, 386.
" 22 : 9, **III.** 44.
" 22 : 10, **II.** 658.
" 22 : 12, **II.** 344, 388, 396, **III.** 323.
" 22 : 14, **III.** 265, 419.
" 22 : 16, **I.** 339, 351, **II.** 415, 418, **III.** 539.
" 22 : 23, **I.** 577.

INDEX OF

AUTHORS, BOOKS, PERIODICALS, ETC.,

QUOTED, AND TO WHICH REFERENCE IS MADE IN THE WORK.

The numbers I. II. III. denote the volumes, and the figures refer to the pages indicated.

Abbey, **I.** 606, 615.
Abbot, **II.** 730.
Abbott and Conant, **I.** 524.
Abbott, **I.** 147, 259, 268, 629, **II.** 672, **III.** 580.
Abdiel, **II.** 367, 394.
Aben Ezra, **II.** 609.
Abrabanel, **III.** 423.
Ackerman, **III.** 392.
Active Christian, The, **III.** 256.
Acuin, **II.** 681.
Ada (Leila), **III.** 417, 419, 421, 426.
Adam (Abbot), **III.** 277.
Adams, **III.** 78.
Adams (J. Q.), **III.** 203.
Adams (Relig. World), **II.** 197, 468.
Adler, **I.** 115, **II.** 54, 232, **III.** 415, 441.
Adso, **II.** 681, 694.
Advance, The, **II.** 421, **III.** 250.
Æthiopic Ver., **II.** 473.
Agassiz, **II.** 488, **III.** 497, 499, 510, 512.
Agobard, **III.** 408.
Agrippa, **II.** 54.
Aikenhead, **III.** 275.
Ainsworth, **II.** 303, **III.** 419.
Alberger, **III.** 147.
Alexander, **I.** 96, 160, 179, 246, 358, 569, 588, 687, **II.** 12, 78, 118, 123, 146, 191, 225, 238, 277, 368, 403, 416, 424, 464–5, 503, 556, 564, 627, 637, 772, **III.** 94, 220, 418, 467, 553.
Alexandrinus Codex, **II.** 426.
Alger, **I.** 115, 450, **II.** 155, 167, 401, **III.** 532.
Alfierio, **II.** 677, **III.** 317.
Alford, **I.** 56, 76, 112, 172, 303, 367, 382, 546, 570, 690, 695, **II.** 27, 31, 43, 103, 207, 218, 281, 291, 317, 322, 326, 351, 378, 412, 414, 421–2, 438, 459, 464, 467, 470, 480, 483, 496, 512, 548, 566, 606, 647, 668, 675, 679, 682, 694, 701–2, 739, 744, **III.** 94, 106, 137, 151, 159, 192, 194–5, 239, 305–6, 313, 322, 363, 367, 372, 374, 380, 534.
Alioli, **III.** 301.
Allam, **III.** 152.
Alleine, **III.** 317.
Allgemeine Zeitung, **I.** 160.
Alliance, Evang., **I.** 133.
Allison, **II.** 642.
Almaric, **II.** 677.
Alstedius, **I.** 538.
Altingius, **III.** 311.
Alzog, **I.** 259, 648, **II.** 98, **III.** 201, 583.
Ambrose, **I.** 691, **II.** 12, 215, 300–1, 322, 398, 445, 450, 680–1, 695.
Ambler, **III.** 154.
Amer. Bible Union Com., **II.** 412.
Amer. Israelite, **II.** 493.
Amer. Tract Soc., **I.** 43, **III.** 196.
Ammon, **I.** 115, 182, 286, **II.** 231, 481, **III.** 347.
Amner, **I.** 568, 677, **II.** 246, 262.
Amour (St.), **II.** 676–7.
Ampere, **III.** 497.
Amyrant, **I.** 522.
Anc. His. of the East, **I.** 217, 236, **III.** 428.
Anc. Sex Worship, **I.** 109.
Anderson, **I.** 524, 535, **III.** 195.
Andreas, **I.** 499, **II.** 649, 694.
Andrews, **II.** 322, 567, **III.** 346.
Andrews (Bh.), **II.** 678.
Andrews (Rev.), **III.** 271.
Angelom, **I.** 59.
Anglican Ch. Conf., **I.** 52.
Annet, **I.** 146.
Ansbert, **II.** 185.

Anselm, II. 431.
Ante-Nicene Lib., I. 487, II. 27, 236, 281, 451, 459, 571.
Apocrapha, II. 236, 250, 340.
Apocraphal books, II. 572, 669, 675.
Apost. Constitutions, II. 680.
Apost Fathers, II. 215.
Apollinaris, I. 451, 491, 496, II. 659, 666, 671, III. 84.
Appeal, An, III. 235.
Appeal to Christians, II. 770.
Appleton's Cyclop., I. 55, 122, 449, 485, 487, 489, 522, II. 232, 366, 567, 643, 697, III. 149, 156, 270, 568.
Appleton's Journal, III. 138.
Aquinas, II. 562, 681.
Arabic Ver., II. 189, 260, 467, 473, III. 400.
Aravanel, III. 400.
Arethas (Cæs.), II. 398.
Aretas, II. 649, 694.
Argyle, Duke of, I. 92, 557.
Aristio, I. 494.
Aristotle, I. 140.
Armory, The, III. 511.
Arnobius, III. 193.
Arnold, I. 93, 111, 208, 335, 650, II. 118, 191, 411, 730, 749, III. 77, 149, 151, 174, 132, 371, 468, 490, 551.
Arnold (On Antich.), II. 678, 707.
Arnold (of Villanova), II. 677.
Arnulf, III. 33.
Arnulphus, II. 676.
Artour, III. 147.
Ascension of Isaiah, II. 572
Asgill, II. 323.
Asher, I. 160.
Assumptio Mosis, I. 458.
Athanasius, III. 512.
Athenagoras, I. 473.
Atlantic Monthly, III. 155.
Auberlen, I. 7, 8, 11, 15, 148, 229, 251, 267, 285, 296, 402, 449, 499, 526, 531, 657, 671, 678, 680, 692, II. 78, 149, 190, 227, 292, 421, 425, 428, 472, 523, 575, 623, 628, 646, 667, 702, 721-2, 741, III. 16, 84, 88, 107, 137, 159, 179, 195, 241, 279, 322, 327, 379, 414, 515.
Audaeus, II. 62.
Audigier, II. 646.
Augsburg Confession, I. 123, 637, 666.
Augustine, I. 29, 59, 94, 211, 229, 306, 313, 324, 326, 329, 378, 431, 499, 508, 523, 601, 615, 679, 682, 691, II. 12, 72, 194, 215, 246, 249, 252-3, 258-9, 322, 367, 398, 430, 445, 450, 475, 482, 488, 490, 495, 503-4, 517, 566, 572, 585, 625-6, 671, 675, 681, 689, 694, 708, 734-5, 774, III. 27, 42, 78, 133, 168, 173, 316, 393, 400, 499.
Auriol, III. 333.
Austin, III. 99.
Aventinus, II. 676.
B., II. 709.
Baader, III. 501.
Babbage, I. 93.
Bachman, II. 693, III. 500.
Bacon, I. 94, 118, 124, III. 443, 510, 511.
Bacon (Roger), I. 452, II. 178.
Bagster, III. 374.
Bähr, I. 159, III. 83.
Bahrdt, I. 623, III. 347, 524.
Baille, I. 531, 535, III. 220.
Baird, III. 409.
Baldwin, I. 210, 221, II. 98, 259, 647, 658, 665, 687, 764, 768, III. 12, 38, 372, 551.
Balfour, II. 204, 696, III. 99.
Ballou, III. 154.
Banner of Light, III. 124, 145-6.
Barbour, I. 363, 382, 537, 542, II. 26, 92, 99, 121, 204, 249, 278, 290, 313, 334, 350, 392, 444, 457, 467-8, 492, 498, 567, 615, 645, 647, 656, 665, 696, III. 133, 142, 163, 269, 272, 372, 378, 462-3.
Barclay, I. 119.
Bardesan, II. 451.
Barker's Bible, III. 24.
Barkey, II. 464.
Baring Gould, I. 217, III. 155.
Barnabas, I. 286, 324, 406, 451, 495, 601, 643, II. 214, 406, 449, 503, 525, 483, 572, 574, 589, 670, III. 27, 31, 267.
Barnard, III. 147.
Barnes, I. 36-9, 53-6, 126, 140, 164, 171-3, 178, 253-7, 263-4, 268, 293-5, 298, 300-2, 309, 316, 327-8, 323, 332, 338, 359, 367, 375, 383, 419, 429, 430, 441, 572, 582, 628, 671-5, 678, 680, 691-4, II. 12, 27-9, 45, 64-9, 72-6, 78, 116, 146, 155, 168, 170-3, 175, 188-9, 205, 213, 219, 222, 229, 240-3, 245-8, 252-8-9, 261-5-8, 270-1-2, 277-9, 281, 293-7, 300-2, 314, 340-1, 351-9, 362, 379, 384, 404-5, 408-9, 410, 415, 420-3, 424, 430-1, 436, 461-2, 464-5, 473-9, 480-6, 495-8, 501, 510, 519, 521, 551-4, 559, 563, 567, 576-9, 580-4, 587, 591, 602-3, 618, 620, 626-8, 631, 634, 647, 652-7-9, 661, etc., 684, 696-7, 706, 715, 734, 741, 751, 765, III. 22, 25, 39, 46, 53-9, 66-7, 99, 100, 103-4-5-6, 115, 123-9, 135, 150, 164-7, 176-7, 192-6, 200, 235-9, 244, 255, 299, 300-1-5, 315, 322, 331, 367, 372-4, 377, 417, 424, 431, 553, 679.
Baronius, I. 509, 520, II. 641, 676, III. 253.
Barrett, II. 165, 232.
Barrow, I. 40, 220, 515, II. 253, 475, 477, III. 69, 336, 571, 577.
Bascombé, III. 510.
Bascom, I. 371, II. 362.
Bassi, I. 132.
Basil, II. 157, III. 84, 300.
Basnage, II. 59, 66.
Bastian, III. 506.
Bauer, I. 9, 32, 60, 268, 433, 448, 458, II. 673, 675, 720, 723, III. 147, 486, 520, 525.

Bauer (Fr.), I. 534.
Bauer (Rev.), III. 138, 338.
Baumgarten, I. 483, II. 466, 470, 675, 702, III. 84, 88, 399, 498.
Baxter (M.), I. 249, 511, II. 282, 322, 329, 647, 659, 667, 674, 683, 685–6, 688, 716, 719, III. 51, 149.
Baxter (R.), I. 691, 697, II. 305, 333, 353, 430, III. 42, 77, 275, 277, 316.
Bayford, III. 306.
Baylee, I. 73.
Beaconsfield, II. 55.
Beale, III. 497, 526.
Beard, II. 672.
Beattie, II. 363.
Beaven, III. 78.
Beaver, I. 453, 501.
Becai (R.), II. 467.
Bechino, III. 99, 148.
Beck, III. 179.
Becker, I. 623.
Becon, I. 534, II. 734.
Bede, I. 431, II. 680, 697, III. 133.
Beecher (E.), I. 104, III. 145, 195.
Beecher (H. W.), I. 54, 71, 115, 425, 475, 586, 692, II. 395, 493, 724, III. 63, 134, 141.
Beecher (L.), III. 196.
Beer, II. 666.
Beeston, I. 534.
Begg, III. 48, 83, 195.
Begin. of Christianity, I. 476, II. 40, 173, 232, 262.
Belcher, I. 96.
Belfrage, III. 187.
Belgian Conf., II. 698.
Bell, II. 322, 465, 575, 679, 701, III. 111.
Bellarmine, I. 110, 112, 513, 647, 662, II. 641, 676, 697, III. 77.
Bellett, II. 472, III. 51.
Ben Ezra, I. 522, II. 675.
Bengel, I, 168, 300, 367, 380, 499, 511, 531, 538–9, 680, II. 185, 191, 218, 317, 324, 421, 446, 454, 457, 475, 480–2, 496, 504, 577, 606, 647, 669, 672–5, 677–9, 683–4, 687, 697, 708, 742, III. 94, 99, 100, 106, 135, 137, 159, 179, 194, 239, 256, 322, 372, 374, 380, 387.
Benjamin (of Tudala), II. 203.
Bennet, I. 482, 495.
Bennett, III. 492.
Benson, I. 541, II. 472, 517, III. 106.
Bentius, II. 322.
Berakyah (R.), II. 467.
Berg, I. 174, 351, 551, 568, 678, 684, II. 296, 627, 764, III. 38, 57, 73, 135, 145, 168, 219, 555.
Berkeley, I. 16.
Berlenburger Bible, I. 534, II. 292, 666.
Bernard, I. 70, 113, 254, 279, 630, 690, II. 398, 675, 679, III. 41, 387.
Bertholdt, II. 247, 652, 663, 734, III. 416.
Beza, I. 33, 313, 405, 577, II. 216, 322, 465, 474, 476, 480–2, 487, 496, 677, III. 67.
Bible Examiner, II. 278.
Bib. Repository, I. 219, II. 292, III. 397.
Bib. Sacra, I. 104, 354, 523, 662, II. 36, 238, 272, 567, III. 257, 271.
Bicheno, I. 626, II. 59.
Bickersteth, I. 30, 34, 63, 112, 164, 172, 285, 296, 326, 382, 415, 450, 534, 541, 549, 678, II. 59, 222, 247, 265, 347, 351, 367, 401, 435, 459, 469, 487–8, 498, 518, 537–9, 549, 528, 659, 668, 671–2, 674–6–7–8, 680, 697, 734, 779, III. 30, 46, 99, 105, 111, 137, 148, 159, 176, 195, 233, 236, 239, 241.
Billroth, I. 72.
Bingham, II. 458.
Birks, I. 70, 75–6, 92, 183, 677–8, II. 322, 350, 382, 456, 530, 537, 599, 628, 659, 668–9, III. 107, 195, 239, 372, 497–8.
Bixby, II. 727, III. 509.
Black, I. 677.
Black (Mess. and Anti-Mess.), II. 678, III. 416.
Blackburne, II. 401.
Blackstone, III. 151.
Blackwood's Mag., II. 16, 99, III. 145. 507.
Blaike, I. 123.
Blair, I. 63, II. 427.
Blaney, II. 109.
Bleek, I. 486, II. 262, 496, 675, III. 363, 400.
Bliss, III. 99.
Bloomfield, I. 36, 48, 171, 295, II. 43, 45, 72, 116, 189, 213, 328, 405–6, 409, 422, 454–5, 462, 465, 473–4, 480, 498, 519, 520, 551–5, 559, 584, 637, III. 59, 184.
Bloomsbury, Lent. Lects., III. 148, 195, 311.
Blumenbach, III. 497, 500.
Bluntschli, I. 651.
Bochart, II. 609, III. 430.
Boehm, II. 496.
Boehme, III. 538.
Boehmen, II. 158, III. 501.
Bogue, I. 382, II. 451, III. 178.
Bohemian Conf. II. 678.
Bohn, II. 681, III. 84.
Bolingbroke, I. 288, 435, II. 771, III. 187.
Bonar, I. 31, 285, 296, 326, 415, 450, II. 140, 214, 219, 242, 521, 544, 668, 672, 679, III. 37, 46, 84, 106, 196, 204, 137, 239, 332, 376, 603.
Bondinet, II. 66.
Bonet, I. 412.
Bonhomme, II. 695, 764, 766.
Bonnet (C.), III. 54.
Bonnett, I. 94, II. 488.
Boothroyd, II. 426.
Boreth, II. 681.
Borger, I. 307.
Borneman, II. 45.
Bossuet, I. 490, 513, II. 215, 673–4, 731, III. 257, 275, 336.
Boston, I. 320.
Boucher, III. 497.

Bowen, I. 81, II. 459, III. 99, 497.
Bowen (Prof.), III. 154.
Bower, I. 516, 520, 662, II. 190, 641, 649, 657, 671, 675–6, 681, 692.
Boyle, I. 94, 271, III. 399, 443.
Boynton, III. 154, 513.
Bradford, I. 531–4, II. 482, 672, III. 147.
Bradlaugh, II. 726, III. 147.
Brahe, I. 538.
Bramhall, II. 673.
Brant, II. 679.
Braune, I. 570, II. 339, 422, 682–3, 697.
Breckenridge (Dr.), I. 459, II. 425, III. 196.
Breckenridge (Prof.), II. 230, 637.
Bremer, III. 510.
Brent, II. 679.
Brentius, III. 108.
Brenz, I. 313.
Bretchneider, II. 212, 427, III. 347.
Brethren at Work, I. 536.
Brewster, II. 223, 667.
Brewster (Sir D.), III. 152, 443, 446, 562.
Bridge, I. 154.
Bridges, II. 116.
Briefs on Proph. Themes, III. 273.
Briggs, I. 466, 481, 489, 492, 494, 497, 507–8, 521, 529, 532. 535, 543, 548, 551, 554, II. 78, 220, III. 253.
Brightman, I. 538, 680, II. 292, 472, 622, 687, 693, III. 372, 378.
Brit. Critic, II. 262.
Brit. Cyclop., I. 523.
Brit. Quart. Rev. I. 84, 405, II. 501, III. 146, 467, 510.
Britten (Mrs.), III. 146.
Britton, III. 145.
Brookes (Dr. J. H.), I. 56, 171, 382, 450, 482, 491, 499, 523, 549, 553, 657, II. 28, 101, 113, 198, 206, 222, 292, 298, 300–1, 317, 322, 324–5, 329, 367, 393, 448, 467, 469, 488, 498, 516, 518, 530, 628, 657, 659, 661, 666–7, 668, 683, 694, 697, 700, 702, 717, 725, III. 107, 154, 168–9, 170, 186, 195, 201, 236, 239, 250, 253, 278, 305–6, 313, 318, 320, 327, 329, 333, 374.
Brooks (Rev. J. W.), I. 49, 63, 149, 164, 172, 285, 297, 326, 431, 440, 451–2, 480, 484–7, 491, 505, 514, 518, 524, 534–5, 611, 626, 643, 678, 682, 691, II. 33, 48, 65, 72–8, 89, 162, 219, 246–7, 265, 349, 394–8, 441, 448–9, 450, 469, 487, 498, 504, 511, 565–8, 672–4, 676–7, 679, 680, 708, 731, 739, 741, III. 48, 105, 137, 176, 195, 241.
Brothers, III. 99.
Broughton, II. 538, 672.
Browne (Archd.), III. 106.
Browne (Bh.), II. 76, III. 107.
Browne (Psls.), II. 170.
Browne (Sir Th.), I. 174, 678, II. 171, 237, 430, 451, 523, 678, 681, III. 77, 101, 113, 201, 315, 337.
Brown (Ch. Sec. Coming), I. 98, 335, 400, 431, 477, 489, 534, 589, 608, 615, 671, 683, 694–5–6, II. 26, 43, 55, 76, 88, 97, 140, 147–8, 153–5, 172, 189, 192, 117–8, 221–3, 237, 247, 263, 272, 279, 283, 285–6, 288, 298, 344, 349, 362, 370, 381–2, 384, 407, 424, 436–7, 446, 455, 470, 478, 480, 510, 514, 517, 521, 530–1, 537–8, 540–2, 544, 556, 564, 573, 587, 601, 603, 622, 626, 637, 733, III. 17, 30, 37, 60–1, 68, 73, 83, 94, 106, 116, 135, 159, 168, 176, 183, 193, 202, 211, 219, 221, 234–5, 244, 255, 268, 299, 312, 314, 321, 331.
Brown (Evang.), II. 27, 321, 324, 564, 682.
Brown (J. Allen), I. 478, 526, 540, II. 237.
Brown (J.), II. 104.
Brown (Messiah), III. 415–6.
Brown (N.), II. 430.
Brown (Pre-Mill.), III. 99.
Brownson, III. 509.
Brückner, III. 60.
Bruno, II. 237, III. 446.
Bruys (Peter de), I. 676.
Bryant, I. 382, 538, III. 498.
Bryce, II. 643.
Bucer, II. 322, 677, III. 336.
Buchanan, II. 66.
Büchner, I. 85, III. 147, 291, 500, 506.
Buck, I. 488, 537, II. 421, 452, III. 268.
Buck (Harm. and Exp.), III. 333.
Buckingham, III. 152.
Buckland, III. 497, 501.
Buckle, I. 45, 648, II. 95, 261, 646, 677, 733, III. 78, 141, 150, 275.
Buddeus, I. 126.
Burkunin, III. 154.
Bull, I. 454, 490, II. 539, III. 346.
Bullinger, I. 322, II. 677, III. 176, 317.
Bungener, I. 601.
Bunsen, I. 111, 352, 656, II. 118, 724, III. 141, 210, 391, 432.
Bunyan, I. 71, 531, 540, 687, II. 459, 471, III. 36, 49, 135, 195, 270, 317.
Burchell, II. 541, 711.
Burdick, II. 272, 283, III. 42.
Burgh, II. 285–6, 509, 659, 673, 675, 683, 702, III. 374.
Burke, I. 648, II. 742.
Burkitt, III. 105.
Burmeister, III. 497–8.
Burnet, I. 126, 313, 450, 498, 514, 531, 697, II. 235, 238, 448, 451–2, 474, 521, 627, 711, III. 99, 270, 501.
Burns, I. 33.
Burns (Trav.), II. 66.
Burr, I. 145.
Burritt, II. 113, 192, 206, III. 152, 256, 300.
Burt, I. 227.
Burton, I. 20, 483, II. 182, 535.
Bush, I. 15, 49, 382, 425, 427, 443, 450, 460, 472, 477, 490–2, 505, 513, 516, 548, II. 12, 96, 149, 230–1–2, 235, 239, 242, 244–5, 256, 265, 271–2, 278, 287, 292, 354, 368, 379, 400–4, 424, 448, 449, 451, 462–4–5,

467, 517, 525, 539, 554, 581–3, 587, 609 622, 628, 635, 638, 710, **III.** 135, 174, 177, 229, 372, 399, 400, 432.
Bushnell, **I.** 101–4, 118, **II.** 158, 619, **III.** 75, 134, 165, 281.
Butler, **III.** 467.
Butler (Apoc.), **II.** 284, 303, 444, 575, 697.
Butler (Bh.), **I.** 70, 83, 93, 137, 145, 149, 155–6, 540, **II.** 239, 488, 531, 598, **III.** 208, 510.
Buxtorf, **II.** 404, 669.
Byant, **III.** 195.
Byron, **II.** 541, **III.** 284.

Cabell, **III.** 500.
C. C., **II.** 321.
Caius, **I.** 454, 485, 497, 502, **III.** 367.
Calixtus, **II.** 677, **III.** 336.
Calla, **I.** 104.
Calman, **II.** 62.
Calmet, **I.** 56, 216, 682, **II.** 66, 78, 215, 236, 430, 673, 677, 706, **III.** 599.
Calovius, **I.** 313, 382, **II.** 322, 474, 656.
Calvert, **III.** 148.
Calvin, **I.** 54, 120, 325, 380, 527, 628, 649, 667, 686, **II.** 27, 29, 120, 216, 252, 277, 322, 394, 415, 430, 435, 445, 454, 463, 465, 480, 482, 484, 488, 512, 584, 588, 672–3, 702, **III.** 23, 60, 69, 94, 105–6, 151, 165, 168, 175–6, 249, 275, 322.
Cameron, **II.** 399, 668.
Campanella, **II.** 124.
Campbell, **I.** 98, 145, 283, 298, 302, 406, 566, **II.** 45, 207, 430, 438, 473–4, **III.** 59.
Campbell (Alex.), **I.** 650, **II.** 78.
Campbell (Th.), **II.** 541.
Candlish, **I.** 76, 299, **III.** 106.
Cano, **II.** 678.
Canstein, **I.** 11.
Carey, **II.** 66.
Carion, **III.** 99.
Carleton, **II.** 246, 281, 421, 464.
Carlisle (Earl of), **III.** 101.
Carlyle, **II.** 720, **III.** 436, 486.
Carnovan (Lord), **II.** 750.
Carpenter, **I.** 94, 157, **II.** 750, **III.** 145, 205, 497, 506, 508.
Carpzov, **II.** 481.
Carson, **I.** 74, **II.** 342, **III.** 539.
Cartwright, **I.** 650, **II.** 322, **III.** 317.
Caryll, **I.** 535.
Casali (Hubert de), **II.** 676.
Cassell, **II.** 481.
Cassiodorus, **II.** 571.
Castellar, **I.** 88, 221 **II.** 646, 720, **III.** 216.
Castellio, **I.** 62, **II.** 219, 474.
Catechism, Edw. VI.'s, **II.** 734.
Catechism, Luther's, **I.** 269.
Catherine (St.), **III.** 178.
Celsus, **I.** 305, 426, **II.** 56, 95, 680, **III.** 357, 475, 483, 490, 518.
Chadbourne, **III.** 510.
Chadwick, **II.** 726, 730.
Chaldee Ver., **II.** 131, 219, 254, 277, 669, 748, **III.** 27, 400, 553.
Chalmers, **I.** 101, 155, 295, 540, 557, **II.** 188, 242, 292, 430, 435, 446, 519, 770, **III.** 36, 195, 204, 443–4, 446, 497, 510, 562.
Chambers, **III.** 392.
Chambers's Cyclop., **I.** 449.
Chambers's Journal, **II.** 429.
Chandler, **I.** 36, 307, 682, **III.** 408.
Chapell, **II.** 681.
Chaplin, **II.** 246.
Charnock, **II.** 430, 485.
Chase, **III.** 106, 149.
Chateaubriand, **II.** 751.
Chemnitz, **II.** 474, 476.
Cheny, **II.** 730.
Chester, **II.** 322, 679, **III.** 137.
Chicago Interior, **III.** 139.
Child, **III.** 510.
Childs, **III.** 145, 147.
Chillingworth, **I.** 56, 110, 135, 450, 452, 458, 483, 513, 515–6.
Choate, **III.** 568.
Ch. Herald, **I.** 432, **II.** 324, 575, 682, 688, 741, 779, **III.** 38, 51, 100, 155–6, 273, 326, 409.
Ch. Intelligencer, **I.** 129, **II.** 296, 344, **III.** 318.
Ch. Instructor, **III.** 179, 215.
Ch. Ministry, **III.** 193.
Ch. Observer, **III.** 188.
Ch. Philanthropist, **II.** 154.
Ch. Pulpit, **I.** 60.
Ch. Review, **III.** 501.
Ch. Union, **I.** 71, 89, 115, 129, 226, 302, 475, 586, 692–3, **II.** 40, 111, 173, 200, 232, 262, 446, 493, 537, **III.** 63, 66, 101, 142, 150, 158, 201, 213, 312, 511, 512.
Ch. Weekly, **III.** 141.
Ch. World, **II.** 697, 771, **III.** 201.
Christlieb, **I.** 32, 70, 76, 95, 137, 140, **II.** 40, 110, 292, 716, 723, 725, 758, **III.** 30, 149, 163, 196, 278, 495, 515, 524, 528.
Christoffel, **I.** 124.
Chronicles of Henry of Huntingdon, **II.** 573.
Chron. of St. Denis, **II.** 642.
Chrysostom, **I.** 382, 431, **II.** 72, 189, 215, 218, 322, 398, 430, 435–6, 445, 482, 504, 530, 555, 568, 671, 680–1, 689, 694, 699, 701, 746–7, **III.** 78, 94, 192, 300, 512.
Church of England, **I.** 110, 412.
Chytræus, **II.** 457, **III.** 99, 176.
Cicero, **II.** 400, 521.
Cin. Commercial, **I.** 86, 160, 352.
Cin. Enquirer, **I.** 232, 779, **II.** 428, **III.** 147, 209.
Cin. Gazette, **I.** 217, 425.
Cin. Times, **III.** 154.
Clamagerau, **II.** 231.
Clark (R. W.), **II.** 464.
Clarke (Man Immort.), **II.** 402, 433.
Clarke (Sac. Lit.), **II.** 491, 496, **III.** 206.

Clarke (Ten Religions), I. 288, 301, 307, 310, 400, II. 59, 155, 262, 521, III. 207, 209, 393.
Clarke (On Lact), II. 458.
Clarke (Com.), I. 36, 313, 381, II. 44, 61, 77–8–9, 109, 158, 213, 236, 250, 254, 256, 266, 277, 354, 357, 404, 408, 421, 438, 446, 457, 465, 474, 483, 488, 496, 504, 580, 587, 593, 669, 672, 710, 732, 734, 737, 762–3, 769, III. 33, 35, 100, 106, 150, 388, 392, 395–6, 399.
Clarke (Diss. on Dragon), II. 668.
Clarke (Proph. Rec.), II. 676.
Clark (Mill.), III. 320, 327.
Clark (Lit. Liv. Age), III. 202.
Clark (D. W.), III. 61.
Clarkson, III. 152.
Claude, I. 145.
Clayton, III. 501.
Clergy of Liege, II. 676.
Clelland, I. 353.
Clemens (Alexd.), I. 431, 451, 496–7, 507, II. 452, 671, 675. 753.
Clemens (Rom.), II. 236.
Clement, I. 48, 451, 473, 482, 494, 600, II. 27, 194. 259, 277, 442, 450, III. 101, 105, 193, 406.
Clementines, II. 670.
Clericus, II. 491.
Clifford, II. 428, III. 155.
Clinton, II. 459, III. 99.
Clutz, III. 141.
Coan, III. 145.
Cobbe, I. 566.
Cobbe (Miss), III. 512.
Cobden, II. 770.
Cocceius, I. 59, 61, 285, II. 322, 368, 472, 474, 496, 646.
Cochrane, I. 354.
Cocker, III. 206, 500.
Cohen, II. 779.
Cogswell, II. 154.
Coke, I. 540, II. 472, III. 106.
Colani, I. 139, II. 165.
Coleman (Antiq.), III. 33.
Coleman (Infid.), III. 492.
Colenso, I. 160, 286, III. 471.
Coleridge. I. 66, 650, II. 111, III. 130.
Collyer, I. 96.
Colyer, III. 148.
Commodian, I. 491, 496, II. 450, 565, 671.
Communication from Tom. Paine, III. 145.
Comprehensive Com., II. 204, 406, 470, 530.
Compte, II. 720, 727–8–9, 750, III. 130, 187, 508.
Conant, II. 417.
Concord, Book of, I. 110.
Confession of Neth., I. 110.
Confession Helvit., I. 110.
Confession Fr. Ref. Ch., II. 672.
Conrad, I. 525.
Conrad (of Mantua), III. 178.
Conrade, I. 538.
Conte, II. 728.
Contemp. Review, I. 44, 157, 692, II. 143, 431, 474, 723, III. 137, 146, 156, 158, 206, 277. 497–8.
Conway, I. 160, 352.
Conybeare & Howson, I. 472, 634, II. 324, III. 78.
Cook, I. 78, 82, 94, 217, II. 232, 488, 779, III. 510, 534.
Cookman, I. 557.
Cooper, III. 148.
Cooper (Rev. Dr.), I. 626, II. 379, 380, 393, III. 327.
Copland, II. 401.
Coptic Ver, III. 301.
Coqueral, I. 62.
Coracion, I. 491, 496. 506, II. 671.
Cornhill Mag., III. 201.
Corrodi, I. 318, 450, 486, 489, II. 144.
Council of Nice, I. 491, 518.
Council of Gap, II. 220.
Cowles, II. 625, III. 84, 392.
Cowper, II. 434, 459.
Cox, I, 482, 514, 524, 534, II. 190, 367, 451, 498, 504, 731, III. 107, 176, 195, 236, 239, 312, 317, 400.
Craig, III. 583.
Cramer, II. 220, 491, III. 95.
Cranmer, I. 531, 541, 691, 697, II. 216, 672, 677.
Cranmer Bible, III. 301.
Craven (Rev. Dr.), I. 40, 52, 283, 535, 549, 557, II. 30, 34–5, 36, 38, 43, 46, 78, 190, 219, 220, 292; 307, 334, 366, 403, 471, 549, 567, 581, 624, 740, 749, III. 52, 108, 132, 178, 320, 327, 374, 380, 384, 386.
Craven, III. 147.
Crawford, I. 145, II. 66.
Creation and Redemption, II. 307.
Credner, II. 363.
Creed of Christendom, The, III. 580.
Cremer, I. 137.
Cressener, I. 538, II. 646, 668, 672.
Crit. Eng. Test., I. 171, II. 411, 519, III. 39, 41, 50, 239.
Crit. and Exp. Com., II. 272, 658.
Crocius, II. 679.
Croly, II. 687, 693.
Cromwell, II. 573.
Crooke, III. 145.
Crool, I. 625, III. 148.
Crosby, I. 137, 535.
Crossby, III. 36, 49, 195.
C. S. B., II. 296.
Cudworth, II. 313, III. 430.
Cumming, I. 382, 511, 515, 678, 691, II. 12, 83, 433. 446, 472, 492. 498, 510, 517, 573, 657, 695, 697, 778, III. 28, 46, 78, 92, 107, 137, 149, 195, 213, 239.
Cunningham, I. 382, II. 195, 367, 459, 645, 647, 668, 672, 686–7, III. 99, 148, 169, 195, 372.
Curry, II. 278, III. 338.

Curtis, III. 447.
Cuvier, III. 495, 497, 500–1.
Cyanthropos, III. 139.
Cyclop. Bib. Lit., II. 678.
Cyril, I. 425, 682, II. 22, 215, 220, 568, 671, 673, 675, 680–1–2, 694.
Cyprian, I. 329, 431, 491, 496, 691, II. 215, 450, 457, 640, 671, III. 276, 408.

Da Costa, II. 470, III. 148, 421.
Dabler, II. 259.
Dahle, III. 278.
Dallas, III. 107, 195.
Daille, II. 452, 487, III. 346.
Damascene, John, II. 680, 694.
Dana, III. 497.
Danæus, II. 672.
Danhauer, II. 292, 481.
Daniels, III. 145.
Dante, II. 642, 676.
Danville Tribune, III. 163, 179, 204.
Darby, II. 22, 668, 683, III. 312.
Darwin, II. 726–7, III. 281, 291, 496–8, 506–8.
Darsilius, II. 676.
Dathius, III. 392.
D'Aubigne, I. 54, 84, 111, 120, 125, 131, 508, 521, 525, 649, 650, 680, 682, II. 117, 216, 642, 677, III. 70, 177, 206, 277, 551.
Daubuz, I. 538, 680, II. 472, 518, 672, 693, III. 57.
Davenport, I. 541.
Davidson, II. 111, 507, 622, III. 135, 349, 371, 382.
Davies, II. 693, III. 138.
Davis, I. 75, 351, 678, II. 121, 418, 674, III. 146, 165, 372.
Davison, I. 59, 164, 168, 305.
Dawson, III. 291, 497, 499, 504, 509.
Dean of Westminster, II. 415.
Decl. of Faith (Congreg.), I. 124.
Decl. of Faith, II. 637.
De Cormenius, II. 124.
De Dieu, II. 471.
Deems, III. 509.
De Hoveden, II. 220.
Deitrich, II. 702.
Delitzsch, I. 31, 229, 285, 531, 552, 617, 671, II. 104, 146, 159, 224, 250, 277, 292, 416, 417, 425 449, 469, 472, 482, 485, 496, 522, 530, 562, 582, 666, 679, 734, 743, 749, 753, 762, 772, 779, III. 24, 123, 159, 189, 195, 297, 397, 414, 497, 515.
De Lyra, I. 382.
Demarest, II. 33, 472, III. 107, 195.
Denny (Sir), II. 659, 683, III. 195.
Denton, III. 147.
Deprez, I. 372, 443, 451, 622, II. 166, III. 116, 235, 241, etc., 367.
Des Cotes, II. 231.
De Wette, I. 72, 159, 286, 628, II. 45, 72, 237, 414, 474, 480, 482, 582, 652, 689, III. 94, 135, 159, 301, 347, 372, 427, 486.
Deylingius, II. 474, 476.
D'Halley, III. 501.
Diaglott, II. 326.
Dick, I. 72, 76, II. 430, III. 54, 61, 446, 562.
Dic. Relig. Knowl., I. 524.
Didron, I. 118.
Dietrich, I. 126.
Dietlieu, II. 415.
D'Israeli, I. 20, 650, II. 775, III. 99, 149, 413.
Dillmar, III. 501.
Diodati, II. 474.
Dionysius, I. 454, 485, 497, 502, 506–7, III. 367.
Divine Footprints, I. 160.
Dixon, I. 217.
Dobbs, III. 136.
Dod, III. 145.
Dodgson, I. 483.
Döderlein, II. 464, III. 347.
Doddridge, I. 53, 284, 307, II. 51, 188, 283, 406, 446, 465, 471, 475, 480, 482–3, 498, 579, 672, III. 196.
Dodwell, I. 450, 482, II. 236, 306.
Doellinger, I. 118, 522, 548, 677, II. 220, 469, 647, 649, 673, 676–7, 681, 694, 734, III. 178.
Doellingius, II. 734.
Dolcino, III. 178.
Donaldson, I. 470.
Donnegan, II. 212.
Dorner, I. 7, 12, 16, 19, 110, 112, 125, 154, 158, 166, 384, 415, 427–8, 464–5, 489, 526, 552, 571, 636, II. 307, 430, 493, 630, III. 270, 326, 411, 418, 534, 538, 559.
Doten, III. 145, 147.
Doten (Miss.), III. 124.
Douay Ver., III. 145, 404.
Douglas, I. 98.
Douglas (Bh.), III. 77–8.
Downame, II. 672.
Draper, I. 78, 160, II. 15, 59, 400, 443, 690, 724, 733, III. 134, 138, 150, 205, 257, 281, 447, 471, 500, 508–9.
Dräseke, II. 25.
Drummond, I. 458, 538, III. 401.
Dublin Univ. Mag., III. 233.
DuBois, Reymond, III. 510.
Duff, III. 106, 333.
Duffield (Dr), I. 498, 540, 549, II. 211, 219, 540, III. 177, 195.
Duffield (Prof.), III. 106, 196, 327.
Duke of Argyle, III. 498, 500, 510, 511.
Duke of Manchester, II. 272, 544, 563, III. 84, 195.
Duke of Somerset, I. 197, III. 224, 483.
Dunn, I. 56, 112, 115, 119, 183, 518, II. 227.
Dunraven, III. 144.
Dupin, II. 518, 641.
Dupuis, III. 522.
Durbin, I. 540.

Durell, III. 148.
Durham, II. 530.
Dury, III. 336.
Düsterdieck, II. 627–8.
Du Veil, II. 322.
Dwight, II. 231, III. 39, 177.
Dykes, III. 339.

Eadie, I. 76.
Eaton, I. 97, 145–6, 154, 200, 460, 492, II. 426, 720, III. 192, 205.
Ebaugh, I. 450, 547.
Eberhard, II. 676–7.
Ebrard, I. 68, 75, 96, 256, 275, 352, 366, 380, 382, 432, 449, 458, 658, 680, 701, II. 25, 97, 190, 214, 291, 421, 472, 475, 530, 556, 667, 687, III. 79, 106, 352, 380, 497–8, 515.
Ecce Deus, I. 196, 204, 623, III. 223.
Ecce Deus-Homo, III. 257.
Ecce Homo, I. 258, 261, 601, 621, 623–4, 665, 699, etc., 700, III. 223, 494, 577.
Eccles, Mag. III. 201.
Eckardt, III. 163.
Eckerman, II. 231, 464, III. 515, 569.
Eckhart, I. 59.
Eclectic Mag., II. 429, 730, 746, III. 51, 145, 155, 157, 446, 498.
Eclectic Review, II. 59, 143.
Edeisborn, II. 59.
Edelman, I. 197.
Edersheim, III. 148.
Edinburgh Review, I. 147, 453, III. 187.
Edmonds, III. 124, 201.
Edrehi, II. 66.
Edward VI.'s Cat. I. 34.
Edwards, I. 174, 195, 248, 257, 285, 320, 534, 671, II. 165, 168, 272, 433, 437, 442, 444, 488, 501, 515, 520, 530, 541, III. 46, 177, 272, 538.
Egbert, II. 412.
Eginhard, II. 641–2.
Eichhorn, I. 56, III. 371, 400.
Eisenheimer, III. 83.
Eisenmenger, I. 48, II. 235, 669.
Elam, III. 498, 500.
Ellicott, I. 49, 59, 66, 76, 78, II. 218, 317, 482, 675, 701–2, III. 107, 195.
Eliezer, II. 448.
Ellinger, III. 566.
Eliot (G.), II. 55, III. 148, 274.
Eliot (J.), I. 541.
Elliott, II. 66.
Elliott (Horæ Apoc.), I. 70, 76, 141, 382, 485, 505, 521, 524, 549, 611, 678, 682, II. 216, 292, 349, 411, 450–1, 459, 472, 498, 509, 628, 645, 647, 652, 657, 668, 672, 686–7, 692–3, 706, 715, 717, 765, III. 52, 100, 105–6, 133, 137, 176, 178, 195, 239, 241, 367, 371–2, 374.
Ellis, II. 678.
Elizabeth (Queen), II. 647.
Elizabeth (Charlotte), II. 295.
E. M., II. 467, 564, III. 236.
Emerson, I. 17, III. 29, 135.
Encyclop. Amer., I. 483, 500.
Encyclop. Brit., I. 455, 490, 508, II. 123, 278, 281, 466, 515.
Encyclop. Metrop., II. 759.
Encyclop. Relig. Knowl., I. 49, 62, II. 187, 198, 581, 609, 676, III. 27, 57, 70, 108, 156, 270, 301, 568.
End of All Things, I. 551.
Engelhart, I. 531, II. 501.
English Independent, III. 409.
Enoch, Book of, II. 313, 572, 675, 771.
Epiphanius, I. 451, 491, III. 145.
Epp Claas, II. 326, 646, 667, 741.
Erasmus, I. 112, 382, 453, II. 482, 496, 584, 673, 678.
Erdman, II. 415.
Erigena, I. 59.
Ernesti, I. 57, 159, III. 569.
Esdras, Sec. Book, II. 250, 327, 442, 574, 675.
Esdras, Fourth Book, II. 572, III. 265.
Essays and Reviews, I. 66, 90, 118–9, 133, 201, 426, II. 431.
Estrange, II. 66.
Etheridge, I. 300, II. 62, 255, 270–1, 404, 452, 710, III. 400, 404, 416, 424.
Ethiopic Ver., II. 189, 260.
Eusebius, I. 271, 451, 466, 468, 471, 483, 485, 499, 505–6, 507, 515, 644, II. 141, 259, 507, 511, 512, 521, III. 193.
Euthemius, II. 322, 380, 398.
Eustathius, II. 675.
Evang. Review, I. 354, 408, 606, III. 145, 287.
Evangelist, The, III. 577.
Evangelist, N. Y. I. 481, 489, 497, 508, 521, 529, 535, 548, 551, II. 219, 220, 272, 283, 317.
Evangeliz. of the World, III. 256.
Evans, I. 96, II. 166, 232, III. 568.
Evelyn, III. 99, 270.
Every Evening, III. 252.
Evolution, III. 522.
Ewald, I. 185, 328, 486, 628, II. 417, 453, 482, 556, 622, 666, 702, 771, III. 60, 372, 392, 437, 473.
Ewer, III. 193.
Exeter, Bishop of, I. 16.
Eyre, III. 148.
Ezra, Eben, III. 404.
Ezra, Fourth Book, II. 754.

Faber, I. 57, 382, 523, 671, 677, 680, II. 48, 89, 106, 108, 195, 204, 249, 337, 401, 497, 502, 518, 643–7, 652, 654–5–7, 668, 673–4, 692–3, 703, 706, 715, 717, 719, 737, 747, 763, 766, III. 25, 63, 69, 99, 106, 148, 498.
Fabri, I. 138, III. 497.
Fabricius, II. 474.
Falconer, II. 690.

Fairbairn, I. 35, 48, 56, 58, 65, 144, 157, 163–9, 171–6–7–8, 205, 210, 216, 218, 236, 243, 254–8, 284, 291–7–8, 302–3–5, 312, 323, 337, 346, 360, 402, 412, 431, 439, 446, 453, 474, 477, 507, 566, 573, 606, 615, 625, 678, 680–2, II. 20, 25, 43, 50–1, 63, 78, 83–4, 88, 111, 118–9, 149, 152, 168, 171, 262, 270–2, 279, 282, 293, 344, 362, 407, 411, 430–2, 443–5, 453, 470, 472, 479, 480, 484–5, 488–9, 534, 555, 567–8, 583, 602–7, 609, 622, 657, 734, 771–2, III. 59, 83, 85–6, 88, 94, 135, 184, 219, 221, 238, 246, 397, 417, 418, 490, 536, 545.
Farmer, I. 72, 538, II. 367, III. 78.
Farrar, I. 91, 98–9, 185, 265, 283, 354, 452, II. 19, 40, 109, 143, 200, 723, III. 137, 151, 569, 589.
Fausset, I. 172, 303, 308, 335, 397, 432, 567, 589, 657, 679, 681, 683–4, II. 76, 79, 89, 130, 146, 195, 218, 241, 247, 249, 255, 259, 299, 412, 419, 425, 445, 478–9, 488, 496, 509, 531, 548, 551, 566, 573–5, 582, 585–7, 590, 618, 637, 647, 657, 667, 682–4, 687–8, 696–7, 702, 741, 758, 766, 769, III. 16, 26–7, 39, 64, 69, 85, 150, 273, 313, 372, 398, 406, 418.
Fect, III. 275.
Fell, II. 676.
Fénelon, III. 275.
Ferguson, II. 214.
Ferrer, II. 681.
Feuerbach, II. 537, 723, III. 147, 430, 590.
Feuerdentius, II. 674.
Fichte, III. 289, 564.
Fiddes, II. 401.
Figuier, I. 147, II. 156, 225, 303, 593, 597, III. 54, 206, 562.
Findlay, II. 643.
Finney, III. 147.
Finney (Dr.), III. 211.
Fischer, II. 237.
Fish, III. 147.
Fishbaugh, III. 145.
Fisher, I. 94, 123, 493, 515, 523, 539, 551, 611, 647, 650, 666, II. 120, III. 173, 331.
Fiske, I. 76, 98, 470, 571, II. 154, 262, 488, 492, 541, 727, III. 281, 357, 483, 511, 519.
Flacius, II. 322.
Flammarion, III. 562.
Flavel, I. 560, II. 40, 222.
Flavius, III. 176.
Fleck, I. 284, II. 45, 321.
Fleetwood, II. 257, 276, III. 541.
Fleming, III. 100.
Flemming, I. 54, 538, II. 672, III. 135, 195.
Fletcher (Rev. J.), I. 540, II. 305.
Fletcher (Is. Red.), II. 66.
Fletcher, III. 148.
Flint, III. 339.
Floerke, I. 678, 680.
Flourens, II. 723.
Fontanes, II. 231, III. 180.
Fontenelle III. 446, 562.
For. Quart. Rev., II. 657.
Form of Concord, I. 122, 578.
Forsyth, III. 107.
Fortnightly Rev., III. 155.
Foster, I. 145, III. 187, 195, 208, 500.
Fowle, I. 44, II. 379, 474, 726, III. 158, 469, 506, 509, 525.
Fowler, I. 94, II. 27, 165, 262.
Fox, I. 119, II. 28, 394, 672.
Fox (Prof.), III. 267.
Foxton, III. 490.
Franklin, I. 32, III. 392.
Fraser, II. 673, 693.
Frazer, I. 167, 420, II. 443, 501, III. 39.
Frazer (Bl. Lights), III. 498.
Frazer's Mag., III. 187–8.
Frederick, II. 668.
Frederick I. and II., II. 676.
Freedom and Fellowship, I. 457, III. 137, 516.
Freeman, II. 643.
Freemantle, III. 84.
Fremdenblatt, III. 156.
French, I. 90.
Frere, I. 678, 680, II. 647, 668, 673, 683, III. 195.
Frey, III. 148.
Froebel, II. 758.
Frohshamer, III. 467.
Frönmüller, II. 454, III. 321.
Frothingham, I. 107, 134, 460, II. 723, 730, III. 147, 154, 204, 283, 288, 483, 572.
Froude, I. 68, 98, 129, 410, II. 749, III. 137, 141, 184, 187, 275, 391, 406, 436, 497, 501, 590.
Frith, II. 672.
Fritzsche, I. 286, II. 321, 473, III. 94.
Fry, II. 419, III. 84, 497.
Fuchs, I. 88, 95.
Fulke, II. 672, 707.
Füller, II. 247.
Fuller, I. 13, 126, 172, 267, 235, 648, II. 73, 259, 445, 517, 637, III. 443, 467, 487.
Fulton, II. 229, III. 13, 14.
Furness, II. 558, III. 577.
Fysh, II. 668, 687, 693.

Galaxy, II. 72, 90, 199, III. 15, 500.
Gale, III. 322, 430.
Galileo, III. 446.
Galloway, II. 692–3.
Gallus, I. 538, III. 178.
Galton, III. 508.
Gannett, III. 283.
Garbett, III. 230–1, 331.
Garbett (Pre.-Mill.), III. 204.
Gardner, III. 145.
Garnet, II. 723.
Garratt, II. 567, 647.
Gascoyne, III. 372.
Gates, I. 60.

Gates Ajar, III. 53.
Gault, II. 672.
Gaulter, II. 322, 672.
Gauntlet, II. 647.
Gaussen, I. 73, II. 692.
Geauga Leader, III. 252.
Geddes, II. 189.
Geekie, III. 187.
Geering, II. 317.
Geier, II. 417, 656.
Geikie, III. 500.
Gelasius, I. 518, 530, II. 440, 499.
Genadius, I. 491, 495.
Genebrand, II. 676.
Gensler, II. 673.
Gerhard, I. 465, 533.
Gerhart, III. 449.
Gerlach, II. 18, 440, 455, 530, 675, 741, III. 192, 195, 386.
German, I. 72.
Germanicus, III. 138.
Gerard, III. 94.
Gerohus, I. 680.
Gerok, II. 465.
Gerson, I. 666.
Gerundeusis, III. 403.
Gesenius, II. 237, 246, 357, 589, 652, 659, III. 401.
Gess, II. 504, 716.
Gibbon (Th.), II. 395.
Gibbon (Edw.), I. 76, 268, 271, 407, 450–1, 454, 460, 470, 477, 484, 488, 492, 501, 681, II. 59, 242, 435, 451, 453, 573, 640–3, 692, 696, 736, 750, III. 14, 37, 77, 108, 275, 316, 408, 416, 475, 512.
Giesler, I. 118, 250, 264, 273, 483, 486, II. 459, III. 270.
Giesy, III. 195.
Gildas, II. 277, 494, 590, III. 93–4.
Giles, I. 75, III. 359.
Gilfillan, II. 495, III. 195.
Gill (Com.), I. 482, 683, II. 214, 236, 409, 459, 471, 485, 517, 687, 693, III. 106, 150, 195.
Gill (Evol. and Prog.), III. 510.
Gilpin, II. 677.
Gipps, II. 271, 282, 287, 292, 530, 625.
Girdlestone, II. 676, III. 148, 312.
Gladden, III. 136.
Gladstone, I. 645, 648, III. 275, 418, 498, 509.
Glanvil, I. 21, 45.
Glasgow, I. 534, II. 154, 366, 646.
Glass, I. 313.
Gleig, I. 96, 216, 277, II. 87, 200, III. 94, 575.
Gloag, II. 471.
Goadby, II. 474.
Gockel, II. 491.
God is love, II. 550, III. 409.
Godet, III. 60.
Godwin, III. 152.
Goethe, I. 635, II. 156, III. 289.
Golden Age, The, III. 283.
Goode, I. 123.
Goodnight, III. 269.
Goodwin, (Rev. Dr.), I. 76, 538, II. 727, III. 250, 253, 327, 332.
Goodwin (Exp. Rev.) II. 292, 367, 406, 472, 504, 568.
Goodwin (Infid.), III. 554.
Good Words, II. 415.
Goodwyn, II. 191.
Gordon, II. 33, 292, 398, 706, III. 107, 318, 327.
Gorgius, III. 178.
Gosse, III. 137.
Goulbourn, I. 127, II. 723.
Gould (Baring), II. 680–1.
Gouthier, II. 676.
Govet, II. 673.
Govinus, I. 431.
Graff ("Greybeard"), I. 57, 106, 111, 116, 353, II. 27, 147, 232, 324, 329, 393, 401, 437, 488, 591, III. 50, 139, 250, 314, 319.
Grant, II. 66.
Graserus, II. 673.
Graves II. 417, 442, 771, III. 16, 526.
Graves (Dean), I. 229.
Gray, I. 633, III. 497, 507.
Great Commission, The, III. 256.
Green, I. 354, III. 498.
Greenabaum, III. 20.
Greenbank, II. 236.
Greenfield, II. 212.
Greg, I. 71, 75, III. 38, 155, 206.
Gregg, III. 137.
Gregory, I. 145, 275, 284, 317, 668, 691, II. 647, 672, 683, III. 467.
Gregory (Four Gospels), III. 192, 352, 354, 359, 401, 575.
Gregory (The Great), I. 59, 318, II. 430, 517, 640, 649, 675, 691, III. 114, 133, 173.
Gregory (Naz.), II. 215, 250.
Gregory (Nyssen), I. 451, 491, II. 190.
Gregory (Oxford), II. 450.
Gregory (Thamat.), I. 508.
Greisbach, II. 638.
Gresley, I. 647.
Greswell, I. 57, 354, 383, 450, 452, 486, 511, II. 29, 215, 236, 421, 472, 668, 696, 698, III. 106, 137, 195, 461.
Griffith, III. 498.
Griffin, II. 517, III. 62.
Grimm, II. 313, 425.
Gröninger School, I. 201.
Grosse, III. 326.
Grostete, II. 677.
Grotius, I. 405, 492, 505, 568, 628, 677, II. 149, 214–5, 246, 322, 354, 380, 464–5, 481, 497, 609, 622, 625, 634, 637, 657, 673, 676, III. 60, 76, 94, 336, 371, 392.
Grove, II. 546.
Groves, III. 269.
Grotz, I. 168, II. 727.
Guardian, III. 143.

Guericke, I. 126.
Guers, III. 148.
Guesses at Truth, III. 233.
Guinness, II. 530, 659, 684, 702, 716, etc., 774.
Guizot, I. 523, III. 205, 257, 275.
Gurney, I. 119, III. 69, 152, 337.
Gurtler, II. 22.
Guyot, III. 497.

Habershon, II. 667, 687, 774, III. 99, 195.
Hackett, II. 465, 472, III. 318.
Häckel, II. 727, III. 497, 500.
Hagenbach, I. 54, 59, 94, 110, 112, 114, 123-4, 158, 285, 425, 450-1-2, 472, 496, 515, 523, 595, 624, II. 291, 361, 401, 632, III. 82, 534, 538-9.
Hahn, II. 399.
Haldane, I. 73, 76, II. 445, 472.
Hale (Sir Math.) III. 77.
Hales, I. 459, III. 99, 403, 424.
Halifax, II. 672.
Halin, III. 154.
Hallam, I. 56, 487, 526.
Hall, I. 57, 145, 540, II. 118, 166, 474, 587, III. 332.
Hall (Bh.), III. 105.
Hall (Newman), I. 551.
Hall (N. Y.), I. 464.
Hall (Rev.), III. 187, 195.
Hamberger, III. 501.
Hamilton, I. 487, 490, 520, II. 66.
Hamilton (Gail), I. 75, III. 512.
Hamilton (Lamp and Lantern), III. 41.
Hammond, II. 215, 220, 474, 476, 487, 517, 625, 673, III 250, 371.
Hammond (Infid.), III. 145, 154.
Hancock, III. 498.
Hand of Man, The, III. 208.
H. A. R., II. 489.
Hardoin, II. 474.
Harduin, II. 673.
Hare, III. 124, 145, 483.
Harkey, II. 751.
Harless, I. 96.
Harley, III. 234.
Harms, II. 679.
Harmer, I. 296, II. 312.
Harper's Mag., I. 221, II. 166, 646, 674, 731, 780, III. 137.
Harper's Weekly, I. 122, III. 133, 187, 409.
Harris, I. 76, 550, II. 124, 145, 276, 333.
Harris (Post-Mill.), III. 204, 214.
Harrison, II. 726, III. 145.
Harrison (Rev.), III. 82.
Hartley, I. 511, 538, 488, 775.
Hartman, II. 469, III. 441, 475, 497-8.
Hartson, III. 145.
Hartwick, III. 498.
Harwood, I. 265.
Hase, I. 472, 484, 489, 508, II. 600, III. 270, 364, 427, 575.
Hastings, III. 179, 195.
Hatch, III. 145.
Hatherly, I. 160.
Hatfield, I. 385, 548.
Haven, I. 96.
Havernach, I. 531.
Hävernick, I. 157, 286, II. 424, 657, 666, III. 33, 399, 414, 498.
Hayden, II. 351.
Haymo, II. 191.
Haywood, III. 508.
Hazard, II. 282, 488, 627, III. 147.
Heaven, III. 53.
Heaven Our Home, II. 505, III. 46.
Heber, II. 207, 353, 430-4, III. 195.
Hedge, I. 75.
Heding, II. 679.
Heefert, I. 110.
Heer, III. 498.
Hegel, II. 101, III. 427.
Hegesippus, I. 468, 471, 495.
Heidelberg, Cat., I. 110.
Heidelberg, Divines of, II. 679.
Helvitia, Latter Conf. of, II. 735.
Helwig, III. 209.
Hemholtz, III. 497.
Henderson, I. 76, 312, 537, II. 187-8, 418, III. 68, 85, 392.
Hengstenberg, I. 176, 214, 227, 229, 250-2-3, 286, 297, 303, 313, 409, 419, 529, 539, 624, 678, 694, II. 72, 97, 238, 463, 585, 623-5-6, 628, 657, 660-2-6, 680, 687, 762, III. 135, 371-2, 392, 400-1, 414, 415, 418, 425, 498.
Henke, II. 231.
Hennell, I. 426, 429, II. 724, III. 188, 289, 441, 511.
Henry (Com.), II. 474, 485, 556, III. 106, 150, 196, 386.
Henry (Prof.), III. 497.
Henshaw, I. 549, II. 265, III. 106, 177, 195.
Hensius, II. 464.
Henslow, III. 507.
Heppe, I. 285.
Hequembourg, II. 199, 230,
Herald of the Morning, II. 120, 413.
Herald of Progress, The, III. 145.
Herbert, I. 154.
Herder, I. 72, 159, 160, II. 504, 674.
Hering, I. 199, 623, 699.
Hermas, I. 451, 495, II. 670, 734.
Hershel, III. 148.
Hervey, I. 352.
Herzog's Cyclop., I. 31, 56, 106, 449, 450, 480, 495, 508, 526, 540, II. 90, 235, 292, 303, 401, 425, 453, 487, 511, 631, 668, 677, 697, 702, 705, III. 33, 84, 88, 135, 159, 367, 414, 423, 569.
Hess, I. 24, 30, 538, II. 504, 531.
Heubner, II. 29, III. 195.
Hewitson, III. 195, 329.
Higging, III. 146.
Higgins, III. 477, 516.
Higginson, II. 730, III. 416.

Hilarian, II. 215, 675.
Hilary, I. 51, II. 322, 398, 674, 680–1, 694, III. 300.
Hilgenfeld, I. 185, II. 673.
Hill, II. 81, 445, III. 330, 509.
Hine, II. 66.
Hints for Evid. of Spiritualism, III. 145.
Hippolytus, I. 111, 491, 496, 684, II. 215, 459, 649, 659, 666, 670, 680–1, 692, 697.
His. Hebrew Monarchy, I. 286.
Hitchcock, II. 428, 435, 481, III. 106, 446, 497.
Hitzig, I. 338, II. 277, 368, 566, 666, III. 392.
Hobart, III. 23.
Hodge, I. 42, 213, 325, 327, 382, 396, 427, 437, 472, 572, 574, 616, II. 79, 187, 230, 234, 240, 281–2, 296, 361, 381, 384, 517, 521, 554, 633, III. 83, 244–5, 318, 336, 507, 509.
Hody, I. 298, II. 245, 414, 422, 427, 430, 438, 480, 483.
Hoe, II. 672, 734.
Hoffman, III. 501.
Hofman, I. 96, 678, II. 666, 675, 682–3, 702, 734, III. 88, 107, 380, 400, 465, 498.
Hofman (Proph. and Ful.), II. 167, 292, 459, 496, 530.
Holden, I. 640, III. 272.
Holmes, I. 452, 535, 538.
Holyoake, III. 147.
Homes, II. 441, 541, 672.
Homilist, I. 607.
Hooker, I. 47, 648, 680, III. 545.
Hooper, II. 672.
Hopkins, I. 60, III 177, 179, 195.
Horchius, II. 679.
Horne, I. 56–8, 60–2, 70–3, 75–6, 96, 112, 141–6, 164, 171–2, 183, 193, 210, 216, 323–7, 345, 485, II. 12, 17, 39, 144, 223, 261, 298, 354, 502, 512, 525, 570, 579, 580, 640, 649, III. 27, 78, 192–3, 307, 301, 307, 393, 413, 418–9, 423–4, 467, 498.
Horsley, I. 171, 243, 314, II. 173, 190, 457, 580, 582, 657, 673, III. 483.
Hosford, II. 36.
Hotho, III. 501.
Houbigant, II. 76, 507.
Hovedan, II. 623, 642, 649, 681.
Howe, III. 69.
Howitt, II. 521, 563, III. 146.
Hudson, I. 103, 140, 573, II. 231, 399, 401.
Huebner, II. 675, 722, 741.
Hug, I. 485.
Hughes, I. 130.
Hughs, III. 301.
Hugo, II. 157, 395, III. 149, 152, 154.
Huidekoper, II. 401.
Hull, III. 147.
Humboldt, II. 425, III. 497, 500.
Hume, I. 98, 137, 288, III. 270, 286, 436, 475.
Humphrey, II. 401.
Hunnius, III. 176.
Hunter, II. 322.
Hurd, I. 57, II. 672, 677, 697.
Hurst, I. 62, 192, II. 118, III. 135, 206, 505.
Huss, II. 677.
Hutcheson, I. 649.
Hutchinson, I. 54, II. 103, 677.
Huther, II. 697.
Hutter, III. 176.
Hutton, II. 426, III. 205.
Huxley, II. 488, 726, III. 159, 206, 281, 475, 497, 498, 506, 508.
Huygen, III. 446, 562.
Hyacinthe, III. 149, 157.
Hystaspes, II. 521.
Hytche, II. 779.

Ignatius, I. 451, 473, 482, 495, II. 424, 572, 671, III. 171.
Illyricus, II. 474.
Imbrie, I. 275, 458, II. 475, 626, III. 136, 327, 556.
Independent, The, I. 40, 475, III. 251.
Ingersoll, II. 582, 723, 726, III. 147, 155, 492.
Ingraham, II. 66.
Inner Kingdom, I. 41, II. 633.
Innes, III. 571.
Inquiry, An, III. 145.
Instructor, The, I. 452, 473, 493.
International Rev., III 137, 507.
Interior, The, II. 51, III. 253.
Investigator, The, I. 538, 691.
Investigator, The Boston, III. 165.
Iowa Synod, II. 691.
Isaki, II. 417.
Israelite Indeed, The, I. 160, 376, II. 246, 261, 568, 685, III. 398, 409, 415, 416, 424.
Irenæus, I. 47, 112, 158, 286, 304, 324, 406, 451, 455, 464, 466, 495, 497, 506–7, 643, 682, II. 144, 214, 250, 253, 287, 398–9, 433, 449, 463, 467, 482, 511, 539, 574, 649, 659, 670, 681–2, 690, 706, 712, 754, III. 38, 52, 78, 169, 193, 239, 542.
Irons, I. 100.
Irving, I. 14, 62, 295, 535, 639, II. 517, 575, 647, III. 76, 82, 273, 534.
Italic Ver., II. 473.

J. B., II. 422, 532.
Jacobson, III. 492.
Jacobus, II. 474, III. 497–8.
Jacopone, II. 677.
Jahn, I. 227, 286, II. 771, III. 16, 498.
James I., II. 676, 693.
James, II. 517, 641, 732, III. 127, 254.
Jamieson, I. 63
Janeway, III. 312, 327.
Jansenius, II. 322, 474, 476.
Jarchi, II. 609, III. 417.
Jarvis, I. 633, 645, II. 459, III. 99.
Jay, II. 517, III. 177, 219.

Jebb, I. 452.
Jeffries, II. 451.
Jenkin, III. 78.
Jesus of History, The, III. 526.
Jevon, III. 508.
Jewell, I. 648, 680, II. 672, 675.
Jewish Chronicle, I. 160, II. 567, III. 412.
Jewish Expositor, II. 66.
Jewish Messenger, III. 423.
Jewish Times, III. 566.
J. G. W., II. 419, 465.
Joachim, II. 677, 681, III. 72, 178.
Joachimus (Abbas), II. 676.
John (of Paris), II. 677.
Johnson, I. 104, 196, II. 730, III. 205.
Johnson (Dr.), I. 698, II. 275.
Johnson (Freed. of Relig.), III. 207, 555.
Johnson (On Relig.), III. 207, 555.
Johnston, II. 451, III. 178.
Jonathan, II. 609.
Jones (Ch. His.), I. 483, 489.
Jones (His. Amer.), II. 66.
Jones (Judge), I. 252–3–4, 264, 285, 296–7, 314, 323, 326, 352–4, 367–8, 381, 383–5, 390, 459, 483, 516, 568, II. 29, 34–5, 41, 44–5, 237, 312, 378, 406, 420, 444, 463–4, 469, 472–4–5–6, 507, 555, 563, 566, 605, 672, III. 137, 195, 542, 571.
Jones (Lec. Apoc.), I. 490.
Jones (Mill.), I. 448.
Jonos (Sir W.), III. 498.
Jonson (Ben), III. 275.
Jordanus, II. 677.
Josephus, I. 216, 228, 265, 682, II. 66, 312, 640, III. 20, 589.
Jost, II. 59, 780.
Journal of the Disciples of Satan, III. 281.
Journal and Messenger, III. 157.
Journal of Sac. Lit., II. 671.
Jowett, II. 673, 679, III. 34.
Jubilee of Jubilees, II. 453.
Jukes, I. 75, II. 468.
Julius (Africanus), II. 659.
Junius, II. 496, III. 401.
Jurien, I. 538.
Justin (Ch. His.), I. 454, 486.
Justin (Martyr), I. 286, 304, 324, 331, 406, 415, 450–1–2, 454–5, 464, 470–2, 480–2, 486, 495, 643, 680, 685, II. 187, 214, 222, 235, 250, 258, 287, 398–9, 415, 445–6, 449, 482–3, 504, 511, 539, 565, 574, 580–2, 587, 670, 681, 714, 753, III. 31, 37, 52, 77, 137, 162, 169, 193, 239, 267, 314, 409.

Kahnis, III. 577.
Kalish, III. 411.
Kanne, III. 501.
Kant, I. 58, 72, 94, 301, III. 130, 347, 427.
Karstein, II. 530.
Kaye, III. 78.
Kay, II. 214, 670.
Keach, II. 472, 672.
Keate, I. 111.
Keerl, I. 104, II. 158, III. 62, 188, 501.
Keil, I. 539, II. 656, 666, III. 88, 392, 497.
Keim, I. 185, III. 524.
Keith, I. 57, II. 242–3, 341, 364, 430, 523, 647, 668, 672, 717, III. 148–9, 195, 382, 391, 397, 418, 467.
Kellogg, III. 168, 327, 331–2.
Kelly, I. 452, 493, II. 322, 472, 683, III. 195, 374.
Kelsall, II. 659, 683.
Kempis, II. 729.
Kendrick, II. 474, 482, 555, 563, 567, III. 66, 363.
Kennicott, I. 314.
Kentucky Tribune, III. 332.
Ker, III. 329.
Kern, II. 673, 675.
Kerkherdere, II. 247.
Kett, I. 57, 538, II. 692.
Ketina, II. 448.
Killen, I. 59, 131, 263, 345, 361, 377, 432, 456, 463, 507, 625, II. 234, III. 78, 174, 339, 382.
Kimchi, II. 277–8, 417, 457, III. 33, 417, 423.
King (Lord), II. 458.
King (Mrs.), II. 418, III. 147.
King (F. W.), III. 501.
King, I. 532, II. 34, 673.
Kingdom of Grace, I. 19, 613, 675, II. 172, 282, 406, 540, 634, III. 211.
Kingsley, I. 601, III. 554.
Kirk, I. 145.
Kitto, I. 56, 176, 216, 226, 450, 483, II. 236, III. 33, 145.
Klee, II. 496.
Kleifoth, I. 539, II. 285.
Kleiforth, II. 628, 656, 666, III. 414.
Klethvich, I. 539.
Klenker, II. 18.
Kling, I. 31, 526, 540–1, II. 292, 297, 425, III. 135, 322.
Knapp, I. 50, 76, 96, 106, 131, 145, 161, 179, 184–5, 195, 211, 261–6, 277, 283, 297, 327, 400, 458, 462, 582, 655, II. 12, 36, 167, 189, 216, 231, 246, 258–9, 300, 340, 352, 366, 398–9, 401–9, 410, 424, 435, 461, 474, 481, 490, 499, 506, 581, 631, 633, III. 60, 78, 301, 457, 515, 542, 558, 568–9, 571–2.
Kniewel, III. 501.
Knight, II. 668.
Knobel, I. 687, III. 392.
Knox, I. 123, 527, II. 216, 435, 472, 504, 672.
Koch, I. 534, 539, II. 292, 630, 666.
Kohler, I. 534.
Köllner, II. 482.
Koppe, I. 534, II. 430, 472, 482, 702.
Koran, II. 187, 417.
Köstlin, II. 247.
Kraft, II. 464.
Kranichfeld, II. 247.

Krause, II. 673.
Krauth, I. 124.
Kreuzhage, III. 501.
Krüdener, III. 180.
Krummacher, I. 701, II. 25, 683, III. 106.
Kuenen, III. 471.
Kuinöhl, II. 454, 465, 471, 473–4.
Kurtz, I. 12, 54–6, 74, 114, 139, 168, 193, 207, 216, 224, 229, 236, 241, 285–6, 293–4, 297–8, 300, 306, 312, 328, 340, 353–4, 488, 500, 505, 525, 531, 537, 556, 571–2, 613, 661, 700, II. 56, 96, 108, 112, 138, 155, 167–8, 225, 240–1. 354, 423 452–3, 469, 482, 484, 500, 504, 546, 556, 562, 567–8, 602, 657, 772, III. 14, 33, 39, 41, 51, 74, 82, 107, 132, 142, 174–8–9, 188, 270, 275, 382, 399, 400–2–3–4, 424, 474, 497–8, 539, 540–4–5, 549, 562.

Lactantius, I. 313, 406, 451, 491, 496, 505, 560, II. 215, 236, 259, 380, 398, 424, 450–1, 458, 482, 503, 539, 540, 574, 639, 649, 671, 675, 680–1, 697, 776, III. 133, 171.
Lacunza, I. 522.
Lamarch, III. 498.
Lambert, III. 501.
Lambert (F.), II. 679.
Lambert (Le Père), I. 522.
Lamertine, II. 589.
Lamp, The Chr., I. 571.
Lampe, III. 60.
Lange, I. 11, 21, 30–5, 40–1, 52, 89, 94, 203, 218, 253, 263–4, 284, 314, 327, 347, 353, 367, 370, 382, 423, 464, 477, 485, 526–9, 533–9, 561–7, 527–8, 657, 668, 686, 690, II. 16, 17, 22–5–7–9, 64, 72–8, 118, 149, 162–5, 175, 187–9, 190–8. 205–9, 218, 220, 241–7, 253–8–9, 260, 277, 292–7–9, 300–7, 317, 321, 324–6, 366, 370, 396, 403–4, 408, 412, 414–5, 417–9, 420–2, 424–6, 431–6–8, 440–6–9, 453, 463–4–5–6, 474–7–9, 480–2–7, 491–2–6, 506, 524, 530, 553–5, 562–7, 581–7, 598, 623–4–8, 634, 665–6–7–8, 673–4–9, 680–2–3–9, 694–7, 699, 701–2, 705, 711, 730–4, 739, 740–1–9, 758, 763–5, 771–9, III. 16, 20–3–5, 33, 67, 72, 81–5–8, 94–5–7, 108–9, 113, 129, 132–7, 147, 150–1, 159, 182, 192–4–5, 217, 230, 297–9, 300–1–5, 313–4, 321–9, 363–4, 374–7–8–9, 380–3–4, 398, 401, 425, 497, 508, 537, 559.
Lapide (Cornel. a), II. 45, 474–6.
Lardner, I. 54, 157, 405, 450, 453–4, II. 264, 312, 507, 539, III. 78, 208.
Latimer, I. 531, 534, 691, II. 451, 457, 672, 734, III. 159, 317.
Latin Vulgate, I. 171, II. 216.
Laud, III. 275.
Launy, II. 474.
Laurence, II. 59.
Lavater, II. 504.
Lavington, III. 275.
Law, I. 154, II. 270.
Lawrence, I. 40, 486, II. 754, 780.
Layard, II. 194.
L. C. B., II. 548.
Leask, II. 173, III. 135, 193, 195–6, 239, 250.
Leathes, I. 89, 105, 263, 269, 442, III. 567, 574.
Le Bas, I. 96.
Lebeau, III. 501.
Lechler, I. 367, 483, 668, II. 463, 465, 482.
Lecky, I. 21, 78, 113, 131–4, 201, 680, II. 690, 750, III. 76, 150, 174, 206, 562.
Leclerc, I. 307, 452, II. 474, 476, 481, 673, III. 401, 501.
Le Conte, III. 507.
Lederer, II. 246, 261, 368, 421, 521, III. 20–1, 398, 409, 415, 416, 424.
Lee, I. 385, 510, II. 230, III. 372.
Leeser, III. 401, 416.
Leibnitz, I. 106, 126, II. 469, 488.
Leifchild, III. 507.
Leigh, II. 212, 322.
Leighton, III. 277.
Leila Ada, III. 108.
Leland, III. 78, 208, 467.
L'Empereur, II. 666.
Lenormant, III. 501.
Lessing, II. 460.
Lessinger, I. 623.
Lester, III. 500–1.
Levi, I. 378, II. 59, 449, III. 412.
Lewes, III. 508.
Lewis (Divine-Human), III. 535.
Lewis (Lucie E.), II. 166.
Lewis (Prof.), I. 36, II. 414, 417, 422, 425, 457, 469, 631.
Lewis (Taylor), III. 497–8–9.
Library, The, I. 692.
Library Mag., III. 201.
Library Notes, I. 17, III. 262, 275.
Liddell and Scott, II. 212.
Liddon, II. 723, III. 478.
Lightfoot, I. 264, 296, 367, 691, II. 235, 247, 321, 402–5, 448, 465, 474, 515, 525, 563, 622–3, 734, III. 301, 346, 416, 418.
Lillie, I. 458, 482, 526, 549, 570, II. 78, 218, 317, 421, 675. III. 177, 194–6, 216.
Limbach, II. 471, 673.
Lincoln, I. 403, II. 28, 104, 324, 326, 509, 530, 612, 637, 682, 702, 709, 740, III. 42, 63, 142, 163, 271, 374–5, 378, 560.
Lincoln (Bh. of), II. 458, 741, III. 78.
Lindsay, I. 455–6, 490, 669, II. 278, 281, 358, 488.
Lisco, I. 534, II. 18, 22, 27, 29, 472, III. 176, 299, 301, 326, 498.
Litch, II. 631, III. 268, 374, 377.
Literalist, I. 52, 382, III. 195.
Lit. and Theol. Journal, I. 63, 422, 677, II. 281, 464, 466, 507, 517, 544, 567, III. 164, 236, 259, 446,—see Lord, D. N.
Littell's Liv. Age, I. 59, 84, 380, 486, 618, 677, II. 156, 405, 469, 724, 726, 729, III. 94, 187–8, 202, 233, 277, 283, 492, 501, 507, 595.

Litton, I. 656.
Liturgy of the Jews, I. 225.
Livy, II. 643.
Lloyd, II. 696.
Locke, I. 36, 53, 94, 100, 146, II. 223, 240, 408, 488, 490, III. 76, 469.
Löhe, I. 126, III. 108.
London (Bh. of), III. 201.
London Quart. Journ. Proph., III. 323, 326.
London Quart. Rev., I. 650, III. 197.
London Times, III. 149.
Longfellow, II. 730.
Longfellow (Infid.), III. 207.
Lord (D. N.), I. 63–4, 73, 76, 164, 173, 285, 332, 678, 681, 683, II. 195–6, 281–2, 284, 290, 363, 367, 379, 384, 450, 466, 469, 483, 487, 489, 500, 517, 519, 538, 544, 548, 567, 602, 626, 645–6, 668, 686, 692, 696, 703–4, 706, 715, 765, III. 39, 47, 57, 83, 89, 99, 105, 133, 137, 164, 177, 195, 236, 239, 270, 331, 372, 374, 377, 446, 498.
Lord (Eliazer), II. 446.
Lord (John King), III. 195.
Lord (J. L.), I. 269.
Lord (Willis), I. 519, II. 729, III. 319.
Lorimer, III. 322.
Lorinus, I. 521, II. 48.
Lotze, III. 497.
Loughborough, II. 381, 549.
Lovell, II. 459.
Lowman, II. 672, III. 16, 100.
Lowne, III. 508.
Lowrey, II. 40.
Lowth, II. 78, 146, 166, 203, 253, 422, 737, 762, 769, III. 24, 277, 392.
Loy, III. 287.
Loyola, I. 618.
Lubbock, I. 107, III. 144, 497, 500.
Lucan, II. 521.
Lücke, I. 486, 523, II. 242, 262, III. 135, 372, 382.
Lum, III. 147.
Lummis, I. 692, II. 35.
Lünemann, II. 190, 317.
Luthardt, I. 265, 656, II. 79, 292, 446, 589, 628, 675, 702, 725, 741, III. 60, 107, 195.
Luthart, III. 515, 533.
Luther, I. 13, 47–8, 55, 59, 120, 124, 133, 295, 309, 325, 342, 382, 504–7, 515, 527, 569, 635, 666, 682, 691, II. 45, 157, 190, 215, 234, 277, 317, 322, 346, 401, 412, 435, 445, 457, 466, 481–2, 484, 487, 496, 504, 584, 637, 642, 652, 656, 672, 677, 696, 712, 714, 734, 744, 749, 760, 764, 766, III. 14, 93–4, 99, 105–6, 114, 133, 135, 139, 145, 159, 175, 178, 249, 256, 275–6, 300, 317, 322, 364, 366, 390, 398–9, 401, 406.
Lutheran, The, I. 532.
Lutheran Evang., The, I. 417, III. 133, 136, 157, 201, 337.
Lutheran Observer, The, I. 122, 171, 540, 543, 658, 662, 684, II. 51, 350, 395, 421, 628, 672, 691, 779, III. 42, 92, 99, 107, 136, 138–9, 142, 150, 154, 157, 165, 188, 247, 251–2, 269, 281, 283, 332, 338, 409, 483, 566.
Lutheran Quarterly, I. 458, 478, 526, 528, 532, II. 154, 228, 237, 401, III. 145, 173, 233, 499.
Lyceum, I. 75, 425.
Lyell, III. 497.
Lyon, II. 36, 43.
Lytton (Lord), II. 113.

M. A., I. 658.
M. A. B., III. 399.
Machiavelli, II. 641, 696.
Macaulay, I. 538, 648, III. 135, 187, 504.
Maccabees (II.), I. 233, 299, 361.
Macdill, I. 451–2, 473, 489, 493, 535.
Macgregor, II. 677.
Mackay, I. 126, 543, III. 327, 332.
Mackay (Prog. of Intel.), III. 522.
Mackinnon, I. 516.
Macknight, I. 212, 298, 402, 415, II. 171, 198, 219, 240, 297, 317, 401, 406, 446, 479, 496, 514, III. 41.
Maclaine, I. 453.
Maclaurin, II. 223.
Macleod, I. 129, II. 594, III. 277, 525.
Macmillan's Mag., I. 140, II. 727, III. 155.
McCaul, I. 300, 538, III. 107, 148, 322, 415, 424.
McCausland, II. 659, III. 497.
McClintock and Strong's Cyclop., I. 40, 51–2, 74, 96, 164, 186, 195, 216, 226–8, 298, 384, 432, 457–8, 485–8, 493, 508, 513, 515, 523, 536–7–9, 540, 551, 649, 687, II. 55, 228, 233, 247, 259, 262, 290, 298, 351, 401, 469, 471, 475, 500, 695–7, 702, 728, 759, 778, III. 78, 156–9, 173, 268, 270, 275–6, 331, 367, 409, 412, 414, 421–2, 423–4–5, 501, 569.
M'Cook, III. 325.
McCosh, I. 92, 94, 354, 556, 583, 622, 663, II. 30, 39, III. 500, 507, 510, 515.
McDonald, II. 197, III. 62, 145, 497.
McIlvaine, I. 123, II. 187, III. 106, 195.
McIntosh, II. 472, III. 195.
McNeile, I. 326, 415, 626, II. 56, 66, 350, 367, 417, 433, 435, III. 107, 148, 179, 195, 236, 239.
Madan, I. 453.
Magee, I. 164.
Mahan (Prest.), III. 93, 152.
Mahan, III. 99, 145.
Maillet, III. 498.
Maimonides, II. 73, III. 408.
Maitland, II. 350, 673, 675, 683, III. 148, 195, 374.
Malachi (St.), III. 142.
Maldonatus, III. 301, 305.
Malebranche, II. 488.
Mallet, II. 521.
Mallery, I. 534.

Mallock, III. 283.
Malvenda, II. 668, 687.
Man, The, III. 282.
Mann, III. 99.
Manasse Ben Israel, II. 235.
Manes, II. 231.
Manford, I. 538.
Manning, I. 645.
Mansel, I. 94, 96, 145, 278, 426, 454, 615, II. 723, III. 145, 287.
March, II. 623.
Marcion, I. 454.
Marcus, II. 673.
Maresius, II. 672–3.
Margoliouth, I. 626, III. 107.
Marks (Prof.), III. 423.
Marks (Rab.), III. 410.
Marlorat, II. 693.
Marochan, III. 421.
Marsden, II. 594.
Marsh, I. 286, II. 208, III. 194, 316.
Marshall, I. 531.
Marshman, II. 66.
Martensen, I. 78, 98, 104, 127–8, 160, 193, 212, 216, 526, 559, 571, II. 118, 123, 169, 184, 401, 411, 471, 489, 636, III. 109, 110, 334, 548.
Martin, I. 583, II. 681.
Martineau (H.), II. 156, III. 507.
Martineau, I. 460, II. 724, III. 498–9, 507, 580.
Martini, III. 408.
Martyr, II. 672.
Marvin, III. 145, 147.
Masculine Cross, The, III. 163, 516.
Maskelyne, III. 145.
Massillon, II. 731, III. 275, 317.
Mason, I. 615, 687, III. 509.
Masson, I. 535.
Mastricht, II. 623.
Mather (C.), I. 154, 541, 680, III. 77, 116, 136, 182, 198.
Mather (I.), I. 367, 541, 691, II. 342, III. 84.
Mather (S.), I. 541.
Mathews, I. 20.
Maton, I. 538, II. 357, III. 148.
Mattison, III. 141, 145.
Maundeville, II. 440, 681, 776, III. 33.
Maurer, II. 130, 566.
Maurice, I. 102, 380, 633, II. 434, 674, III. 498.
Maurice (Mill.), III. 148.
Maxwell, II. 429.
Mayer, I. 522.
Mede, I. 14, 296–7, 382, 452–3, 454, 481, 485, 506, 538, 671, 678, II. 62, 72, 108, 115, 222, 235, 247, 285, 287, 292, 364, 369, 381, 409, 435, 441, 448–9, 504, 518, 539, 541, 549, 628, 640, 645–6, 654, 657, 672, 696, 710, III. 17, 99, 135, 159, 372, 380.
Meet for Heaven, III. 53.
Melanchthon, I. 48, 112, 123, 125, 527, 635. 666, II. 216, 451, 456, 482, 672, 677, III. 94, 105, 135, 159, 176, 275, 317.
Melito, I. 451, 491, 495, II. 539, 671.
Melville, II. 531, III. 117.
Member of the Boston Bar, A, II. 91, 683.
Menassah Ben Israel, II. 409.
Mendelssohn, II. 417.
Menken, II. 454.
Mercersburg Rev., I. 285.
Meredith, III. 147.
Merrill, I. 652, II. 167.
Messiah's Herald, I. 543, III. 325.
Methodist, The, II. 350,
Meth. Quart. Rev., I. 354, II. 158.
Meth. Recorder, III. 334.
Methodius, I. 451, 491, 496, II. 671.
Meurer, I. 691, II. 435, 496.
Meyer, I. 45, 195, 258, 283, 339, 472, 628, 690, II. 35, 37, 72, 90, 100, 236, 272, 292, 322, 414, 446, 470, 482, 502, 555, 587, III. 60, 94, 106, 151, 159, 301, 306, 583.
Meyers, III. 437.
Meyrick, II. 680, 687, 690, 703.
Michael, II. 481.
Michaelis, I. 57, 224, 453, II. 300, 355, 603, 679, 771, III. 16, 486, 594, 597, 599.
Michelet, I. 59, 125, 342, 507, II. 203, 496, 637, 677, 726, 734, 749, 750, III. 105, 176, 317, 390.
Michelet (Bible of Hum.), III. 206.
Middlebrook, III. 146.
Middleton, I. 48, 453, 487, III. 77, 346,
Mildert (Bh. Van), I. 171.
Mill, I. 82–3, 98, 103, 108, 189, 229, 352, II. 750, III. 130, 159, 430, 441, 491, 498, 508–9.
Miller, I. 201, II. 99.
Miller (Hugh), II 438, III. 497.
Miller (Rev. S.), III. 287, 559.
Miller (Sil. of the Scrip.), III. 483.
Miller (Sec. Adv.), II. 602, III. 166.
Miller (Rom. of Astron.), II. 428.
Milman, I. 48, 219, 456, 468, 488, 503, II. 59, 62, 73, 100, 223, 236, 261, 410, 453, 759.
Milner, I. 59, 483, 526, III. 177.
Milner (Dr.), III. 77.
Milton, I. 124, III. 317.
Mishna, II. 368.
Mission of Inquiry, II. 449 III. 88, 107.
Mistake of Christendom, III. 145.
Mivart, III. 500.
Modern Christianity, III. 280.
Moehler, I. 513, 656.
Mohammed, III. 33.
Moll, I. 34, 557, 573, II. 431, 446, 455–6, 606, 615, 771.
Moleschott, I. 104.
Moliter, III. 501.
Mollock, III. 477.
Molther, I. 117.
Molyneux, II. 683.
Mombert, II. 449, 454.

Moneta, I. 305.
Montagu, II. 676.
Montaigne, III. 275.
Montesquieu, I. 8, 224.
Month. Relig. Mag., I. 75.
Montholon, III. 534.
Moody, III. 139, 141–2, 251.
Moore, I. 551, III. 378.
Moore (Com.), I. 686, II. 106, 188, 394, 418, 506, III. 392.
Moore (H.), I. 16.
Moore (Rev. Dr. D.), III. 23.
Moore (Lost Tribes), II. 66.
Moorehead, I. 452, 489, III. 24, 179, 215.
More, II. 645, 647, 672.
More (Sir Th.), III. 274.
Morell, I. 55, 71, III. 486.
Morgan, I. 192, 282, II. 726.
Morley (M. P.), III. 157.
Morley (Infid.), III. 155.
Morris, I. 354, III. 94.
Mortimore, II. 447.
Morus, II. 471, III. 347.
Mosheim, I. 49, 56, 58, 62, 305, 407, 454, 460, 465, 468, 483, 500, 525, 532, 538, 550, 611, II. 149, 640, 676, 688, III. 51, 69, 72, 174, 275.
Motley, III. 275–6.
Moulton, II. 190.
Mountford, I. 96.
Mozley, I. 75, 101, 114, 509, II. 723.
M. S., III. 99.
Mueller, III. 500.
Muencher, I. 452, 483, 498.
Mühler, III. 338.
Müller (Geo.), III. 175, 236, 325.
Müller (J.), I. 11, 104, 106, III. 336, 497, 500.
Müller (Max), I. 289, III. 188, 433, 439.
Müller, I. 126, 161, 417, 532, II. 594, 607, 724.
Munster, II. 474, 476.
Murdock, I. 532, II. 474.
Murphy, II. 728, III. 143, 498, 501, 509.
Murray (Rev.), III. 144.
Murray, III. 154.
Musculus, II. 322, 672, III. 23.

Naebe, II. 474.
Nägelsbach, II. 62, 64, 260, 277, 418, 492, III. 69, 72.
Nachmonides (R.), II. 467.
Napier, II. 687, III. 99.
Napoleon I., III. 534.
Nast, I. 96, 263, 283, 323, 382, 430, 433, 484, 540, 551, 607, 651, 657, 690, 695, 701, II. 57, 167, 190, 192, 222, 228, 299, 321, 331, 341, 397, 421, 445, 471, 492, 498, 561, 564–5, 758, III. 81, 134, 192, 304, 333.
Nathaniel, II. 259, 368, 421, 681, III. 107–8, 571.
Nation, The, II. 726.
Nat. Reformer, II. 726.
Nat. Review, I. 460, II. 726, III. 580.
Nead, I. 536.
Neal, I. 650, II. 59, III. 270.
Neale, I. 531.
Neander, I. 9, 40–7–8, 56, 60, 103, 112, 113, 195–8, 218, 256, 261–2–8, 277, 283, 318, 324, 339, 360–3, 370, 415, 425, 428, 433–6, 443–5–9, 452, 454–7, 461, 471–4, 486, 493–5–6, 500, 510, 559, 571, 611, 629, 630–3, 641–2, 649, 658, 665–6, 698, 700, II. 12, 16, 26–9, 30–9, 45, 98, 124, 160–7, 187–9, 194, 221, 234, 242, 400, 430, 440, 452, 481–2, 512, 555, 558–9, 574, 584, 598, 634, 670, 675, III. 14, 60, 69, 78, 171–2–3, 183, 193, 206, 267, 270, 299, 337, 371, 409, 427, 430–1, 515, 534, 539, 549, 558–9, 561, 565, 596.
Nelson, II. 230, 674.
Nemours, III. 54.
Nepos, I. 491, 496, 506, II. 671.
Nevin, I. 16, 113, 201, 434, 568, II. 397, 673, III. 336, 438.
Newcome (Archb.), I. 541, II. 78, 188, 419, 459, 497, 501, 519, III. 392.
Newman (Essays, etc.), III. 391, 483, 486.
Newman (Prof.), III. 78.
Newman (F. W.), I. 71.
Newman (J. H.), I. 202.
Newman, I. 76, 113–4, 126, 202, 227, 336, 498, II. 675, 726, III. 590.
Newton (Bh.), I. 14, 57, 145, 172, 452, 482, 514, 524, 678, 682, 671, 691, 696, II. 56, 64, 162, 213, 219, 220, 242, 272–3, 319, 367, 393, 421, 435, 446, 448, 498, 536, 538, 564, 588, 639, 640–3–5–7, 650, 652–5–7, 666–7, 671–2, 675–6, 686–7, 694, 696–7, 700, III. 16, 76, 78, 100, 159, 174, 193, 195, 371, 393, 399, 401, 403, 406, 418, 443, 467.
Newton (Benj.), III. 374.
Newton (B. W.), II. 659.
Newton (Sir I.), I. 94, 169, 173, 289, 482, 485, 538, 671, II. 223, 457, 472, 498, 518, 650, 686, 692, 696, III. 97, 159, 195.
Newton (Miss), III. 333.
Newton (R.), III. 106, 117, 145.
N. Y. Evangelist, II. 625, III. 42, 188.
N. Y. Herald, III. 149.
N. Y. Independent, III. 134, 267.
N. Y. Observer, I. 552.
N. Y. Times, III. 138.
N. Y. Tribune, III. 92, 154, 252.
N. Y. World, III. 137.
Nicholas, I. 60.
Nicholas, III. 202.
Nicholson, II. 667, III. 327.
Nicolai, II. 734.
Nicolini, II. 598, III. 77.
Niebuhr, II. 749, III. 151, 428.
Niemyer, I. 123, 532.
Nineteenth Cent., III. 157, 283.
Nippold, III. 551.

Nisbett, II. 165, 230.
Nissen, II. 430.
Nitsch, III. 338.
Nitzsch, I. 29, III. 78.
Noble, I. 165, 366.
Noble Lesson, The, II. 680.
Noel, I. 326, 415, 696, II. 56, 433, 435, 593, 598, III. 46, 107, 179, 195, 328.
Noel (Baptist), III. 551.
Nordhuff, I. 74, 571, 669.
North Amer. Rev., II. 54, 232, III. 140–1, 415.
North Brit. Rev., I. 51, 55, 57, 71, 75–6, 89, 98, 107, 115, 119, 124, 129, 131, 428, 507–8, 656, II. 514, 573, 643, 724, 728–9, 779, III. 141, 145, 149, 152, 155, 173, 188, 430, 444, 446, 483, 522.
Norton, I. 96, 157, III. 349, 357.
Noyes, I. 473, 622, II. 146, 622, III. 24.
Nürmberg Bible, II. 624, 626.

Oberlin Rev., I. 461, III. 93.
Ode, II. 657.
Œcolampadius, I. 131, II. 656, 672.
Oehler, II. 453, III. 569.
Oettenger, I. 531, II. 675, 702, III. 195.
Offen, III. 147.
Ogilvy, II. 509, III. 195.
Oken, III. 498, 500.
Old and New, I. 515, II. 424.
Oldfield, III. 145.
Olearius, II. 474, 476.
Oliphant, I. 14, 62, 295, 535, III. 76, 82, 273, 534.
Olive, II. 676.
Olshausen, I. 29, 42, 94, 176, 178, 258, 262, 274, 309, 359, 361, 367, 370, 378, 409, 414, 446, 472–4, 478, 501, 649, 695, II. 25, 33, 40, 45, 162, 195, 218–9, 220, 317, 321–5, 412–4, 420, 445, 459, 462, 465, 471, 474, 480–2, 504, 536, 554, 562–4–6, 582, 600, 606, 649, 675, 680, 682, 689, 701–2, 734, 737, 739, III. 69, 106, 110, 116, 137, 151, 159, 194, 297, 306, 317, 366, 380.
Onkelos, II. 609.
Oosterzee, I. 16, 29, 30–1, 45, 76, 95, 106, 113, 123, 127, 135, 151, 158, 161–2, 184, 229, 252–4, 258, 273, 293, 353, 371, 382, 392, 434, 436, 440, 472, 474, 477, 556, 566, 571, 600, 618, 655–6, 663, 681, II. 43–4, 78, 165, 167, 189, 291, 302, 367, 399, 401, 407, 421, 425, 477, 481, 496, 636, 679, 723, III. 34, 107–8, 110, 125, 135, 147, 151, 154, 162, 182, 187, 196, 209, 211, 238, 278, 297, 321, 323, 358, 515, 535, 555, 569, 573, 577.
Orcutt, III. 147.
Origen, I. 58–9, 290, 305, 322, 324, 358, 382, 425, 451, 455, 457, 462, 497, 499, etc., 611, 644, 685, II. 72, 242, 398–9, 400, 416, 430, 436, 450, 467, 490, 507, 512, 521, 539, 541, 568, 671, 681, III. 53, 57, 60, 82, 169, 338, 346, 357, 423, 444, 449, 501, 505, 539.
Ort, III. 249.
Osiander, I. 12, II. 457, III. 95, 176.
Oswald, II. 50, 81–2, 295, III. 195.
Oughtred, II. 48.
Our Eternal Home, III. 53.
Our Heavenly Home, III. 53.
Ovid, II. 521.
Owen, I. 75, 96, 98, 121, 606, II. 40, 172, 403, 406, 474, 496, 515, 672, III. 124, 147, 151, 187, 201, 206, 441, 497–8.
Oxford (Bishop of), III. 143.
Oxford (Chancellor of Univ.), I. 111.
Oxford Divines, III. 76.
Oxley, II. 67.

Pallzow, III. 347.
Page, III. 498.
Pagini, I. 522.
Paine, I. 104, II. 22, 597, III. 347.
Paley, I. 90, 556, 648, II. 208, 510.
Palfrey, II. 558.
Palgrave, II. 643, III. 262.
Palmer, I. 531, III. 27.
Pallister, II. 488.
Panzer, II. 678.
Parables of Enoch, I. 570.
Paradiso, II. 676.
Paræus, I. 511, II. 281, 457, 497, 693, III. 99, 176, 336.
Pardæus, II. 322.
Parker, I. 49, 60, 72, 74, 112, 118, 168, 200, III. 147, 205, 279, 486, 489, 490, 560.
Parker (On Proph.), II. 659.
Parkhurst, I. 195, II. 219.
Papias, I. 324, 451, 466, 495, 506, II. 449, 511, III. 31, 78, 239.
Parson, II. 741.
Parsons, II. 683, III. 327, 533.
Partridge, III. 111.
Pascal, I. 104, 135, 192, III. 287.
Pasor, II. 212.
Path to Paradise, III. 70.
Paterson, III. 332.
Paton, II. 120, 468.
Patriarchs, Twelve, II. 540.
Patrick, I. 313, II. 417, 771.
Patrick (St.), II. 540.
Patterson, III. 231.
Pattison, III. 498.
Paulinus, I. 451, 491.
Paulus, I. 382, II. 45, III. 521.
Peabody, III. 509.
Pearce, I. 54, II. 253, 299, 322.
Pearson (Bh.), II. 236.
Pearson, I. 532, III. 424, 569.
Pecaut, I. 436.
Peebles, III. 147.
Peel, III. 149.
Pellican, II. 322.
Pelt, II. 674.

Penn, II. 66.
Penrose, I. 96.
Penn. Monthly, III. 507.
Perfectionist, The, I. 461.
Perowne, II. 111.
Perry, II. 541, 711, III. 84.
Persic Ver., II. 473.
Perthes (De), III. 497.
Peterman, III. 201.
Peterson, I. 538.
Petrarch, II. 676.
Pezron, II. 449.
Pfaffius, II. 474.
Pfeiffer, I. 313.
Pfleiderer, II. 292.
Philippi, II. 414, 480, 482, III. 159.
Philipson, III. 412.
Phillip, II. 343.
Phillips, II. 322, 683.
Philo, II. 106, 448, 462, 474, III. 187, 411, 418.
Philo-Judæus, II. 96, 521, III. 471.
Philostorgius, III. 84.
Philpot, II. 677, III. 328.
Photius, I. 496.
Physicus, II. 726, III. 281.
Plato, II. 521, III. 532, 589.
Pliny, III. 535.
Plutarch, II. 521, III. 549.
Piazzi, III. 99.
Pickering, II. 212.
Pickets, II. 166.
Picton, III. 499.
Pictorial Bible, II. 609.
Pictorial His. Engl., III. 270.
Piers, I. 540, II. 322.
Pierson, III. 149.
Pinkerton, I. 133, 537.
Piscator, I. 382, 534, 538, II. 472, 474, 496, III. 176, 317.
Pise, I. 515.
Pius IV., Creed of, II. 573.
Pococke, II. 247, 404.
Poiret, III. 306, 538.
Polycarp, I. 451, 455, 473, 482, 495, 497, II. 382, 400, 572, 670.
Polloch, II. 540.
Pond, III. 145.
Poole, I. 314, III. 501.
Poor, II. 297, 396, 426, III. 108.
Pope, II. 430, 517.
Pope (Le Roy), I. 65.
Pop. Science Monthly, I. 94, 140, II. 239, 263, 428, 488, 724, 726–8, 750, III. 146–7, 155, 158, 208, 441, 499, 506, 508–9.
Porphyry, I. 52, 384, II. 246, 657, III. 475.
Porter, I. 58–9, 157, II. 683.
Porter (Pres.), III. 142, 251.
Porteus, I. 647.
Post, III. 154.
Pothinus, I. 495.
Potter, I. 410, 427, 459, II. 726, III. 137, 146, 575, 577, 580.
Powell, I. 88, 98, 426, III. 499.
Poynet, I. 531.
Pratt, I. 653, III. 497, 501, 509.
Preiswerk, I. 148.
Pre-Mill. Essays, I. 275, II. 683.
Presbyterian, The, III. 105, 157, 332.
Presbyterian (Central), I. 551.
Presbyterian Quart. Rev., I. 173, 385, II. 283, III. 211.
Prescott, II. 750, III. 275.
Press, The, III. 410.
Pressense, I. 51, 59, 81, 159, 167, 212, 267, 295, 299, 327–8, 377, 436, 438, 443, 450, 466, 468, 471, 473, 485, 584, 589, 639, II. 118, 284, 312, 367, 398, 447, 470, 472, 480, 512, 679, 729, 741, 750, III. 154, 206, 338, 363, 382, 535, 569.
Prideaux, II. 149, 622, 673.
Pridham, II. 472, III. 195.
Priest, I. 568, II. 235, 241, 303, 451, 520, 547, 575, 709, 710.
Priestley, I. 435, 485, II. 197, 231, III. 346, 412, 522, 534.
Primasius, II. 659, III. 372.
Prime, III. 108.
Princeton Rev., I. 75, 90, 96, 110, 119, 124, 168, 456, 458, 550, 567, 598, 610, II. 53, 206, 326, 437, 537, 622, 626–7, 724, 758, III. 63, 136, 150, 157, 201, 212, 231, 273, 278, 331–2, 397, 409, 535.
Prize Peace Essays, II. 152.
Procter, I. 92, 94, II. 429, III. 446.
Proph. News, II. 67, 779, III. 108.
Proph. Times, I. 153, 296, 382, 402, 452, 455, 464, 484, 490, 498, 534, 540, 607, 658, II. 36 40, 55, 72, 112, 191, 207–8, 241, 282, 292, 296, 298, 314, 317, 319, 321–2, 325, 328, 335, 362, 422, 451, 465, 467, 489, 504, 531–2, 536, 548, 564, 567, 583, 681–2, 685, 695, 764, 766, 709, 716, III. 25, 48, 96, 107–8, 111, 133, 135, 139, 141, 152, 169, 189, 193, 195, 235–6, 243, 250, 305, 316, 317, 322, 331, 369, 398, 409, 410, 431, 436, 460.
Proude, II. 141.
Proudhon, III. 187.
Prudentius, II. 398.
Psalterium Salamonis, I. 458.
Purden, II. 647.
Purdon, II. 322, 683, 710.
Purpose of Existence, The, III. 536.
Purvey, II. 191.
Pusey, I. 498.
Putnam, III. 147.

Quarterly Review; see British, London, Lutheran, etc.
Quatrefages, III. 500–1.
Quenstedt, II. 428, III. 176.
Quesnel, II. 322.
Quick, II. 678.
Quintard, III. 107.
Quinten, I. 54.

Qurieu, III. 99.

Rabett, II. 672.
Radcliffe, III. 507.
Raffles, III. 136.
Ralston, II. 125, 279, 282–3, 628, III. 35, 73, 100, 372.
Ramsay, III. 145, 195.
Ramsey, II. 672.
Randall, II. 73.
Randolph, III. 147.
Randolph (Rev. Dr.), III. 163, 179, 204, 331.
Ranke, I. 680, III. 187.
Rapp, I. 537.
Raumer, III. 500–1.
Ravanell, II. 322.
Rawlandson, III. 326.
Rawlinson, II. 203.
Raynaud, I. 13.
Read, III. 108.
Reade, I. 86, 108.
Reade (Infid.), III. 147.
Reber, III. 134, 573.
Rechenberg II. 672, 691.
Reclus, II. 157.
Redeemer's Last Com., III. 256.
Reed, II. 36.
Rees's Cyclop., I. 450, 453, 472, 508, II. 94, 123, 681.
Reeves, III. 262.
Reiche, II. 482.
Reichel, III. 501.
Reimarus, III. 347.
Reineke, II. 321–2, 682, 685, 700, 710, 739, 758, 761–2, 763, III. 20, 305.
Reinhard, II. 292, 303, 430.
Reland, III. 33.
Relig. Cyclop., II. 358.
Relig. Philos. Journal, I. 137, 157, 446, III. 145, 521–2, 568.
Renan, I. 13, 43, 60, 92, 97, 112, 169, 190, 199, 263, 267–8, 286, 288, 354, 260, 370, 373, 384, 398, 424, 426, 428, 433, 436, 470, 472, 513, 568, 622, 661, 665, II. 40, 164, 223, 559, 669, 720, 726, 732, III. 147, 155, 188, 359, 412, 427, 480, 482, 491, 519, 523, 534, 577.
Repertory, Princeton, II. 602, 634.
Repository, Bib., II. 636, 638.
Reubelt, III. 535.
Reuss, I. 32, 147, 158, 184, 204, 218, 258, 282, 327, 348, 354, 364, 371–2, 408, 410, 416, 436, 440, 459, 460, 472, 479, 484, 562, 585, 660, 680, II. 50, 72, 249, 261–2, 266, 585, 631, 669, 675, III. 60, 73, 80, 349, 363, 367, 382, 460, 601.
Reville, III. 384, 560.
Revision, I. 209, 317, 326, 548, 551, 581, 587, 638, 714, 763.
Rice, II. 408, III. 83.
Richard I., II. 681.
Richards, II. 567.
Richers, III. 501.
Richter, I. 534, II. 367, 599, 630, III. 36.
Riddle, I. 56, 487.
Ridley, II. 677, III. 275, 317.
Rieger, III. 327.
Rierck, II. 628.
Riggenbach, II. 682, 687, 689, 722, 730, 740–1, III. 109, 195, 320, 327, 358.
Riland, II. 673.
Riley, III. 311, 406.
Rinault, II. 398.
Rinck, II. 530.
Ripon (Bh. of), III. 409.
Rizer, II. 55.
Roach, II. 668.
Roberts, II. 67, 695–6.
Robertson, I. 75, 464, 566, III. 270.
Robinson, I. 620, II. 514, 588.
Robinson (Rev.), III. 215.
Robison, I. 40, 129, II. 169, 230, 267, 412, 475, 477, 499, 623.
Rochall, III. 501.
Rodgers, I. 584, II. 282, 585.
Rogers (H.), III. 506.
Rogers, I. 86, 96, 101, 105, 140, 146, 155, 160, 217, 291, II. 110, 776, III. 180, 498, 511, 535, 577.
Rogers (Refor.), II. 677.
Röhr, I. 88.
Rojas, II. 678.
Rolle, III. 497.
Rollicus, II. 496.
Rollin, III. 400.
Romaine, II. 252.
Roos I. 534, 538, 680, II. 214, 292, 421, 668, 675, 679, 702, 741, III. 416, 501.
Roscoe, I. 132, 639.
Rosenmüller, I. 53, 307, II. 237, 244, 277, 471, 481–2, III. 416, 501.
Ross, II. 219, 322.
Rossler, I. 452.
Rothe, I. 8, 14, 15, 112, 470, 639, 651, 656, II. 118, 307, 425, 445, 459, 599, 628, 637, III. 551, 596.
Rothschild, II. 59.
Rougement, III. 501.
Rousseau, III. 144, 592.
Row, I. 78, 89, 96, 137, 149, 159, 433, 688, III. 469, 474.
Rowe, I. 698, III. 48, 88.
Rückert, II. 72, 482.
Rudd, I. 541.
Rudolph, III. 306.
Ruge, I. 425,
Rule, II. 59.
Rupertus, II. 674.
Rupp, I. 119, 450, 536, 547, III. 37, 268, 416.
Ruskin, I. 692, III. 156, 201.
Russell (Bh.), I. 450, 483–4, 485, 490, 548, II. 448–9, 451, 468, III. 177.
Russell (C. T.), II. 29, 122, 232, 278, 290, 326, 334, 383, 638, III. 163, 269 272 401.

Russell (Dr.), I. 320, 537, III. 231.
Russell (Lord J.), III. 148, 201.
Rutherford, II. 673, III. 317.
Rutter, I. 259, 382, 515, II. 43, 91, 173, 206, 321, 372, 446, 451, 556, 734, III. 66, 94, 217, 300.
Rycaut, II. 187.
Ryckel, II. 676.
Ryle, II. 421, 566, 619, III. 107, 137, 195.

Saadias, II. 609.
Sabine, III. 136, 195.
Saccas, III. 504.
Sack, I. 313.
Sailman, II. 66.
Salisbury (Marquis of), II. 723.
Salmasius, II. 214, III. 275.
Salvador, I. 469.
Samaritan Ver., II. 709, III. 400.
Samuel (R.), II. 467.
Samuels, II. 66.
Sanborn, I. 312, 348, 523, II. 196, 282, 302, 456, III. 173.
Sander, II. 453, III. 99.
Sanderson, I. 145.
Sandy, III. 349.
Sandys, II. 677.
Sarbieski, II. 141.
Saturday Rev., II. 59.
Saunders, I. 20.
Saurin, I. 116.
Savage, II. 537, 727, III. 158, 511.
Savonarola, I. 639.
Saybrook Platform, III. 135.
Scaliger, I. 448.
Scapula, II. 19.
Schaden, III. 501.
Schaff, I. 110, 121, 123, 199, 253, 264, 296, 428, 470, 483, 506, 532, 567–8, 686, 690, II. 321, 421, 427, 436, 470, 585, 736, III. 78, 81, 94–5, 139, 300, 305, 310, 376, 380, 384, 387, 418, 438, 515, 534, 596.
Scheckenburger, I. 264, II. 482, 673, 702.
Schelling, I. 72, II. 736.
Schellwig, III. 233.
Schem, I. 485, III. 201.
Schenkel, I. 135, 658, 699, II. 166, 191, III. 520, 523–4, 527, 577.
Schenkendorf, II. 649.
Schlegel, I. 104, 197, 226, 457, 483, 525, 575, 681, II. 33, 502, III. 171, 208, 427.
Schleiermacher, I. 94, 102, 112, 168, 286, III. 359, 427, 486, 524.
Schlessinger, I. 429.
Schloegel, I. 691.
Schmetzer, II. 401.
Schmid, I. 30, 43, 158, 184, 327, 360, 370, 438, 647, 657, II. 427, 472, 475, 481, 555, 716, III. 34, 60, 172.
Schmidt, II. 33, 44, III. 500, 508.
Schmoller, II. 78, 415.
Schmucker (J. G.), I. 96, 123, 126, 170, 207, 325, 327, 525, 637, 680, 682, 688, II. 155, 285, 295, 351, 593, 600, 684, 751.
Schmucker (S. M.), II. 59.
Schmucker (S. S.), II. 153, 155, III. 202, 336.
Schneider, II. 474.
Schodde, I. 458.
Schoebel, III. 501.
Schoetgen, II. 214, 404, 455, 673, 702, III. 83, 418, 571.
Scholten, I. 436.
Schott, I. 351, III. 370.
Schroeder, II. 63, 253, 625.
Schultetus, II. 212, III. 23.
Schulz, II. 464.
Schultz, III. 363.
Schwenkfeld, I. 54, 119, 571.
Scleusner, II. 19, 455, 465.
Scotch Conf. I. 52.
Scott (Com.), I. 262, 389, 432, II. 51, 62, 106, 213, 218–9, 223, 247, 253, 406, 412, 452, 457, 465, 474, 487, 501, 520, 587, 673, 751, III. 99, 108, 148, 177, 196, 392.
Scott (Infid.), III. 521.
Scribner's Monthly, I. 129, 606, II. 430, III. 137, 158, 497–8, 507.
Sear, II. 401.
Sears, III. 535.
Sedgewick, III. 497.
Seebohn, II. 643, 692.
Seebohm, III. 270.
Seely, I. 111, 601, 662.
Seiss, I. 48, 71, 296, 342, 382, 440, 450, 482, 487, 491, 511, 514, 519, 524, 532–3, 538, 541, 549, 553, II. 22, 28, 33, 144, 206, 211, 265, 282, 285, 292, 299, 317, 322, 325, 335, 346, 355, 367, 393, 403, 421, 430, 433, 450–1, 457, 466, 472, 477, 488, 504, 517, 519, 520, 659, 683, 700–1, 717, 735, 758, III. 24, 46, 94–5, 105, 137, 145, 151, 153, 168–9, 170, 175–6, 177, 186, 195, 202, 228, 233, 239, 241, 276, 304–6, 308–9, 317–8, 320, 334, 371, 374, 380, 385, 461, 561, 589.
Selden, II. 609, 771.
Selnecker, II. 282, 292, 317.
Selwyn, III. 107.
Semisch, I. 449, 452, 480, 495, 531, II. 303, 445, 511, III. 418.
Semler, I. 58, 198, 425.
Seneca, II. 521.
Senex, I. 658, II. 35.
Septuagint, II. 64, 189, 260, 270, 426, 462, 464, 580, 709, III. 396, 400.
Sepp, I. 160, II. 188.
Sermonizer, I. 694.
Sermons (Univ. Ch.), II. 428.
Serres, III. 497.
Service, I. 75.
Severus, I. 407, 484, 491, 682–3, II. 671–2, 675, 680.
Seward, I. 645.
Seyffarth, II. 144.

Shaftesbury, III. 13.
Shakespeare, II. 520.
Sharpe, III. 99.
Shedd, I. 50, 59, 318, 427, 452, 458, 482, 486, 489, 496–7, 507, 531, 534, II. 78.
Shefer, III. 147.
Sheldon, II. 673.
Shenkel, III. 460, 520, 523–4, 527, 577,—see Schenkel.
Sherer, I. 62, 182.
Sherlock, I. 54, 57, 126, 305, III. 399.
Sherwin, I. 538.
Shields, III. 510.
Shimeall, I. 59, 326, 385, 440, 458, 480, 482, 489, 490–1, 495, 497, 505, 515, 524, 534, II. 65, 149, 444, 450, 509, 510, 511, 522, 529, 531, 533, 622, 675, III. 83, 99, 176, 195, 239, 241.
Shopenhauer, II. 469, III. 441, 475.
Shubert, III. 500–1.
Sibylline Books, I. 458, 486, II. 101, 220, 236, 340, 467, 521, 541, 572, 631, 649, 669, 675, 680, 754, 771.
Sigonius, II. 641.
Silliman (Anna), II. 453.
Silliman, I. 300.
Simeon (R.), II. 131.
Simon, II. 66, 474, 476.
Simplicius, II. 521.
Simpson (Bh.), II. 771.
Simpson, III. 413, 418.
Sirr, II. 20, 23, 281, 285, 292, 298, 367, 419, 464, 482, 487, 492, 498, 501, 553, 561, 564, 582. 638, III. 195, 400.
Sismondi, III. 206.
Six Letters, III. 76.
Sleidan, II. 216.
Smalcald Articles, II. 672, 691.
Smile, II. 103.
Smith (Goldwin), II. 157, 726, 746, III. 145, 155.
Smith's Bib. Dic., I. 56, 96, 114, 216, 296, 505, II. 235, 668–9, 673, 676–7, 680, 687–8–9, 690, 692, 694, 701, 703, 706, 759, III. 20, 301, 365, 423.
Smith (Key), II. 157, 166, 283, 530, 751, III. 46, 386.
Smith (T.), II. 498.
Smith (J. D.), III. 51.
Smith (On Dan'l.), II. 657, III. 26.
Smith (Speculations), III. 509.
Smith (N. Test. His.), I. 484, II. 18, 59.
Smith (Payne), I. 169.
Smith (Pye), I. 30, 164, II. 517, III. 415, 425, 497, 501.
Smith (Jos.), I. 114, 537, III. 37.
Smith, I. 96, II. 652, 673.
Smyth, III. 99. 464.
Smythe, III. 507.
Smythe (Infid.), III. 147.
Snell, II. 472, III. 195.
Snow, I. 618.
Snow (Miss), III. 271.
Snowden, III. 42.
Sober Words, III. 145.
Socrates (His.), I. 425.
Solomon (R.), II. 457.
Somerset (Duke of), I. 90, 307, 378, 388, 469, 591, 613, 645.
Sophocles, II. 520.
South, I. 145, II. 408.
Southard, III. 268.
Southern Churchman, III. 409.
Spalatin, I. 13.
Spangenberg, I. 537.
Sparkes, II. 658.
Sparry, III. 201.
Spaulding (Bh.), III. 187.
Spaulding, I. 542, 691, III. 195.
Speaker's Com., III. 474.
Spear, I. 44, III. 124.
Spectator, I. 380, II. 729, III. 492.
Speer, III. 274.
Speiss, III. 152, 505.
Spence, II. 626.
Spencer, I. 129, 147, III. 206, 281, 441, 499, 506, 508–9.
Spencer (Conf. to Augs. Conf.), III. 195.
Spencer, I. 426, II. 157, 724, 726, 746.
Spener, I. 54, 124, 531, 540, 552, II. 430.
Spes Fidelium, III. 312.
Spicer, III. 145.
Spinoza, III. 573.
Spiritism in the Bible, III. 145.
Spiritualist Conv., I. 95.
Spiritual Mag., I. 75.
Spiritual Teleg., III. 124.
Sprague, II. 751.
Sprecher, I. 56–7, 74, 81, 89, 98, 124, 129, 166, 326, 401, 417, 427, II. 27, 427, 725, III. 179, 277, 281, 434, 443, 444, 511, 573, 603.
Spring, I. 63, 70, III. 409, 597.
Springfellow, II. 101.
Springfield Republic, III. 141, 202.
Spurgeon, I. 551, III. 106, 169, 195, 213.
Stackhouse, I. 465.
Stahl, I. 129.
Stange, II. 237.
Stanley, I. 75, 123, 154, 163, 169, 217, 229, 295–6, 301, 516, II. 118, 261, 505, 637, 679, 736, 769, 771, III. 20, 26–7, 33, 77, 134, 151, 174, 182, 277, 551.
Starke, I. 30, II. 292, 454, 459.
Stäudlin, II. 652.
St. Clair, III. 508.
Stearns, III. 189.
Steele, II. 169, 363, 510, III. 235.
Steir, I. 72, 382, 627, II. 33, 43, 89, 190, 421, 454, 459, 472, 476, 482, 492, 566, 585, 606, III. 23, 94, 106–7, 305–6.
Stephen, III. 571.
Stephen (Infid.), III. 155.
Stephens, III. 471.
Stephenson, III. 50, 106.
Steudal, II. 504, III. 515.

Stevenson, I. 54, II. 634, III. 150.
Stewart (Lects. on Lent), III. 330.
Stewart (Uns. Univ.), II. 429.
Stilling, I. 74, II. 290, 399, III. 99, 232.
Stillingfleet, I. 145, 177, II. 697, III. 430, 501.
Stockius, II. 212.
Stockton, III. 313.
Stolz, II. 474.
Stone, III. 163–4, 266.
Storr, I. 43, 72, 251, 280, 314, 344, 370, 556, 680, II. 18, 205, 357, 399, 494, 554, 635–6, 638, III. 304.
Storrs, III. 201, 269.
Stowe, I. 70, 77, III. 349, 412.
Strabo, II. 521.
Strange, II. 659, 683.
Strauss, I. 9, 60, 92, 147, 268, 359, 433, II. 191, 559, 723, III. 147, 155, 159, 163, 359, 369, 467, 475, 482–3, 512, 520, 524, 527.
Ströbel, III. 364.
Strong, I. 320.
Stuart, I. 112, 164, 173–4, 297, 300, 323, 450, 480, 489, 490, 529, 540, 677, II. 152, 185, 220, 241, 264–5, 267, 270, 272, 279, 298, 311, 340, 406, 411, 414, 452, 455, 472, 574, 577, 584, 620, 622–3, 647, 663, 665, 669, 675, 680, 683, 706, 743, 753, III. 41, 116, 129, 135, 186, 367, 372, 377.
Stuckenberg, I. 126, II. 427, III. 138, 337, 516.
Sturges, III. 65.
Stutz, III. 498.
Suddard, III. 187.
Suetonius, III. 589.
Suicer, II. 212, 322.
Summius, II. 66.
Sumner (Archb.), I. 168.
Sumner, III. 498.
Sun, The (N. Y.), I. 54.
Swartz, II. 628, III. 274.
Swedenborg, I. 58–9, 114, 118, 174, 290, II. 166, 230, 367, III. 54, 275, 539, 573–4.
Swift, I. 20.
Swiss, Ver., II. 317.
Swormstedt, I 569, 657, II. 223, 380, 433, 658, 768, III. 99, 150, 163, 274, 373, 378.
Symington, I. 633.
Sympson, I. 354.
Syphers, III. 492.
Syriac Ver. II. 189, 260, 299, 317, 462, 465, 467, 473, 653, 737, III. 301, 400.
Syrus (Ephraim), II. 680.

Tacitus, II. 643, III. 589.
Taine, III. 483.
Tait, II. 428, III. 499.
Talbot, III. 107.
Talitskoi, II. 674.
Talmage, II. 153, 242, III. 38, 156.
Talmud, I. 60, II. 261, 270, 313, 404, III. 400, 415, 571.
Targums, II. 78, 254–5, 259, 266, 270–1, 404, 511, III. 392, 400, 402–4, 416, 423–4.
Tasso, III. 35.
Tatian, I. 451, 473, 495.
Taunton, II. 659, 683.
Tausend-jährige Reich, Das, III. 203.
Taylor (Bh.), I. 483, 509, II. 398, 450, III. 78.
Taylor (Is.), II. 110, III. 54, 211, 346.
Taylor (Jer.), II. 45, 128, III. 275.
Taylor (Old Theol.), II. 166, 192.
Taylor (Syntagma), III. 568.
Taylor (Voice of the Church), I. 450, 482, 521, 524, 534, 536, 611, 682, II. 162, 190, 212, 219, 220, 305, 367, 448, 450, 484, 504, 623, 770, III. 105, 135, 176, 195–6, 241, 317.
Tazewell, II. 673.
Teacher, The, III. 141.
Teelman, II. 22.
Telegraph, The, III. 154, 577.
Telesphorus, II. 677.
Tennyson, II. 746.
Tergaud, II. 676.
Terry, II. 427.
Tertullian, I. 48, 174, 281, 286, 313, 451, 453, 466, 491, 496, 506, 510, 617, 643, 691, II. 215, 250, 259, 277, 287, 297, 398, 400, 450, 463, 467, 482, 483, 523, 525, 565, 648, 670, 681, 694, 708, III. 27, 52, 58, 169, 193, 239.
Thackeray, II. 594, 616.
Thamer, I. 119.
Theirs, I. 81, II. 749.
Theiss, III. 374.
Thelwall, III. 148.
Theocratic Eng. His., III. 15.
Theodore, II. 701
Theodore (Mopsuestia), III. 486.
Theodoret, II. 189, 215, 259, 328, 398, 445, 496, 504, 568, 632, 656, 673, 680, 689, 701, 711, III. 33, 193.
Theol. Fac. of Dorpat, I. 126, II. 176.
Theophilus, I. 431, 473.
Theophylact, I. 568, II. 189, 322, 410, 496, 568, 680, 689.
Theurer, I. 658.
Thiersch, I. 639, II. 445, 675.
Thirlby, I. 452.
Thirty-two Wonders, III. 145.
Tholuck, I. 96, 102, 309, 425, 576, II. 72, 290, 435, 445, 468, 480–2, 496, 504, 723, III. 195–6, 278, 501, 515.
Thomas (Dr.), I. 54, II. 43, 45, 91, 278, 518, 611, 665, 668, 695, 707, III. 26, 41, 50, 84, 88, 142, 148, 260, etc., 274, 339, 373.
Thomas (Hom. Com.), II. 373.
Thompson (Archb.), II. 723.
Thompson, I. 31, 92, 129, 184, 198, 250, 298, 371, 556, 616, 619, 632, 681, II. 231, 236, 298, 401, 630, III. 33, 157, 499, 507, 510.
Thorndyke, II. 673.
Thorowgood, II. 66.

Thorp, I. 285, 540, II. 778.
Thorpe, III. 195.
Thorpe (North Myth.), II. 521.
Thruston, II. 778.
Thucydides, III. 266.
Tischendorf, I. 561, 597, II. 66, 121, 185, 278, 295, 301, 548, 608, 683, III. 262, 265, 349, 357.
Tickuor, II. 751.
Tillinghast, I. 333.
Tillotson, I. 452, II. 370, III. 94, 106, 275.
Tilton, III. 283.
Time of the End, I. 524, 534, 538, 541, II. 449, III. 105, 176 195.
Times-Star, The, I. 118, III. 82, 201.
Titman, I. 199.
Tocqueville (De), II. 749, 761.
Todd, II. 668, III. 374.
Toland, I. 146.
Toldoth Jeshu, III. 419.
Tomlinson, II. 51, 242, 446, 451.
Toplady, I. 541, II. 485, III. 196.
Townsend, II. 96, 433, 474.
Train, II. 723.
Trapp, II. 322.
Tregelles, I. 73, 679, 681, 694, II. 28, 246, 277, 587, 657–8, 661, 666–9, 679, 683, 687–8, 697, 717, III. 26, 107, 195, 374, 382.
Trench, I. 98, 568, II. 19, 22, 25, 28–9, 36, 401, 467, 475–6, 668, 679, 696, III. 304–5, 318, 330, 379.
Triglot, II. 474.
Troutman, III. 78.
Trowbridge, III. 509.
Truth, The, I. 73, II. 28, 702, III. 253, 305–6.
Truth-Seeker, The, III. 522.
Tübingen Bible, III. 11.
Tullock, I. 124, III. 507, 575.
Turnbull, III. 438.
Turner, II. 668, 681, III. 498.
Turretin, I. 210, II. 622–3.
Tuttle, I. 628, III. 145, 147, 521.
Twelve Patriarchs, I. 217, 571, II. 235, 313.
Twenty Reasons, II. 451.
Twesten, I. 96, 166, III. 428, 487.
Twisse, I. 531, 535, II. 539.
Tyerman, I. 117, 539, 540, II. 292, III. 236, 277.
Tyndale, I. 672, III. 317.
Tyndall, I. 85, 147, 534, II. 188, 239, 374, 429, 485, 488, 593, 724, 726.
Tyng, II. 162, 328, 444, 574, 702, III. 78, 106–7, 196, 251, 327, 330.
Tyso, I. 509, 630, III. 83, 148.

Ubertinus, II. 677.
Ueberweg, I. 51, 455, 515, 681.
Uhden, I. 633, 645, III. 583.
Uhlhorn, I. 96, 479, 518, II. 728, 730.
Uhlman, I. 119, 698, III. 534.
Ulhorn, III. 515.
Ulman, III. 515, 549, 559.
Ulrici, I. 140, II. 232, III. 440, 498.
Umbreit, I. 159.
Underwood, III. 147.
Universalist Quart., II. 234.
Universe No Desert, The, III. 446.
Unseen Universe, I. 96, II. 429.
Upham, I. 96, II. 236.
Upham (On Peace), III. 152.
Urban, III. 33.
Uri, II. 666.
Urwick, I. 694, II. 505, 517, III. 134.
Usher, II. 459, 622, III. 99, 343, 346, 430.
Usteri, I. 577, II. 445, 486.
Uzziel, III. 392

Valentine, I. 451, 491, II. 237.
Valpy, III. 99.
Van Ess, II. 474, III. 301.
Van Laun, II. 395, III. 275.
Van Mildert, III. 233.
Van Noorden, I. 376.
Van Valkenburg, II. 636, 638.
Vance, I. 396.
Vares, I. 45.
Variorum, II. 36–7, 190, 324.
Varley, II. 779, III. 141.
Vaticanus Cod., II. 191.
Vaughan, III. 97, 145.
Vaughen, I. 123, 645, II. 314.
Venillot, II. 731.
Vicentius, I. 130.
Victorinus, I. 451, 491, 496, II. 398, 451, 565, 649, 659, 671, 675, 681, 714, III. 372, 380.
Vienne and Lyons, Churches of, I. 496, II. 259.
Vieriri, I. 677, II. 646.
Vince, I. 98.
Vincent, III. 498.
Vinet, I. 146.
Vint, II. 149.
Virgil, II. 521.
Vitalis, I. 491, II. 641.
Vitringa, I. 246, II. 22, 24, 27, 72, 244, 608, 657, 672, 676, 679, 687, 693, III. 23, 48, 129, 178, 377, 380.
Voghst, III. 501.
Voght, I. 104, III. 497.
Volch, III. 88.
Volck, I. 531.
Volk, I. 484.
Volkman, I. 185.
Volkstaat, II. 780.
Volney, I. 288.
Voltaire, I. 169, 288, 306, 426, II. 690, III. 475.
Voysey, III. 147.
Vulgate, II. 189, 204, 260, 297–8, 300, 308, 462, 465, 496, 551, 580, 653, 737, III. 301.

Waggoner, I. 180, 563, 579, II. 29, 49, 50, 83, 222–3, 411, 422, 529, 531, 541, 543, 576, 627, 631, 647, III. 41, 50, 88, 164, 212, 266–7, 369.
Wagner (A.), III. 501.
Wagner, III. 497–8, 575.
Wahl, II. 14, 212, 218,
Wake, I. 487.
Wakefield, II. 36.
Walch, I. 126, 427, II. 451, III. 106, 175.
Waldegrave, I. 58, 64, 161, 312, 417, 456, 694, II. 206, 219, 271–2, 279, 292, 365, 437, 510, 540, 622, 625, 628, III. 46, 135, 168, 183 233, 235, 255, 328.
Walker, I. 101, 185, 435, III. 510.
Wallace, II. 648, III. 144, 276, 497, 500.
Walley, I. 541.
Walmsley, II. 708.
Walsingham, III. 276.
Wangle, II. 647.
Warburton, I. 238, 303, 310, 648, II. 442, 498, 672.
Ward, I. 264, II. 36, 46, 406, III. 179, 195.
Wardlaw, I. 90, 96.
Warner, I. 298, III. 33, 51.
Warren, I. 692, II. 221.
Warring, III. 498–9.
Washburn, I. 75, III. 257, 509.
Wasson, II, 730.
Waterland, I. 126, 453, III. 346.
Watson, I. 354, 475.
Watson (Infid.). III. 147.
Watts, I. 642, II. 300, 430.
Watts (Infid.), III. 147.
Wayland, III. 236.
Waymarks, II. 688, III. 273.
W. E. B., III. 92.
Weber, III. 23.
Webster, II. 476.
Webster (D.), II. 779, III. 447.
Webster (On Peace), III. 152.
Webster and Wilkenson, I. 76, III. 94.
Wedekind, III. 338.
Weekly, The (Woodhull's), III. 101.
Wegschneider, III. 347.
Weigel, III. 539.
Weil, II. 759.
Weisenger, I. 577.
Weiser, III. 139.
Weisman, II. 679.
Weiss, II. 730, III. 147, 515.
Wells, III. 141.
Wendle, III. 157.
Werner, III. 501.
Wescott, I. 76.
Wesley (J.), I. 117, 539, II. 292, 367, 412, 427, 430, 435, 446, 457, 474, 484, 488, 521, 549, III. 99, 100, 106, 135, 196, 236, 277.
Wesley (C.), I. 540, II. 353, 427, 430, 434, III. 196.
West, I. 125, 482, 489, 515, 524, 538, 551, 553, 555, II. 321, 482, 623, 628, III. 204, 327, 331.
Westcott, III. 349.
Western Chr. Advocate, I. 484, 540, 652, II. 565, III. 146.
Westminster Ass. Annot., II. 214.
Westminster Conf., I. 110. 124, III. 168.
Westminster Rev, I. 68, 91, 347, 436, 472, 478, II. 116. 164, 242, 253, 343, 411, 563, 622, 723, III. 36, 48, 146, 180, 187, 278, 437, 468.
Wetstein, I. 195, 297, II. 220, 368, 405, 454, 521, 627, 674, III. 129, 301, 371.
Whately, I. 76, 98, 124, 212, 271, 670, II. 94, 123, 282, 401, III. 208, 483.
Whedon, II. 234.
Whewell, III. 562.
Whiston, I. 486, 487, 538, II. 66, III. 99, 148, 399, 501.
Whitby, I. 36, 262, 450, 464, 472, 482, 484, 548, II. 49, 76, 84, 216, 221, 265, 408, 448, 455, 481, 498, 546, 554–5, 626, 673, III. 39, 177, etc., 239, 346.
White, I. 527, II. 230, 626, 657, III. 509.
White (Infid.), III. 447.
White (Sev.-Day-Adv.), III. 142, 150, 163, 263, etc., 265, etc.
White (U. S. Min.), III. 138.
Whitfield, I. 540.
Whiting, I. 541, II. 45, 246, III. 145.
Whittaker, I. 634, II. 672–3, III. 148.
Whittle, III. 332.
Whright, II. 727, III. 206.
Wichart, III. 501.
Wieseler, I. 486.
W. I. G., I. 264.
Wigand, II. 673.
Wilberforce, II. 723.
Wilberforce (Bh.), III. 107.
Wild, I. 684, II. 67, 153, 206, 695, 764, 778, III. 26, 100, 168, 274.
Wiley, III. 182.
Wilkinson, II. 414.
Williams, I. 127, 622.
Williams (Bh.), II. 673.
Williams (Essays), III. 425.
Williams (I.), III. 372.
Williamson, I. 81, 105–6, 164, 404, 422, 557, II. 29, 50, 233, 469, III. 511.
Wilson (Dr.). I. 163, 633, 684, II. 241, 314, 564, 683, III. 25, 48, 104, 106, 145, 236, 331, 394, 575.
Wilson (His.), II. 643.
Wilson (Isr. Orig.), II. 66.
Wilson (Pre-His. Man), III. 500.
Winans, III. 147.
Winchell, III. 509.
Winchester (Bh. of), II. 723.
Winebrenner, I. 536.
Wines, I. 217, 219, 224, 227–8, 238, 298, 311, II. 100–1, 126, 355, 417, 608, 610, 777–8, 780, III. 16, 430, 432, 592–4.
Wing, II. 241.

Winslow, **II.** 173, 501.
Winthrop, **I.** 63, 164, 614, **II.** 246, 282, 406, 487, 540, 638, **III.** 179, 195.
Wirt, **I.** 536.
Wisdom, Book of, **II.** 585.
Wise, **II.** 493.
Wise (Rab.), **III.** 155, 414.
Wiseman, **III.** 498.
Witnessing Church, **III.** 256.
Witsius, **I.** 320, **II.** 279, 282, 285, **III.** 430.
Wittie, **II.** 447.
Wittenberger, The, **II.** 153, 727, **III.** 203, 434.
Wolf, **I.** 53, **II.** 66, 471, **III.** 498.
Wolf (Miss), **III.** 135, 236.
Wolfe, **III.** 145, 421.
Wolff, **III.** 99.
Wollaston, **I.** 93.
Wood, **I.** 511, 538, **II.** 488, **III.** 99, 148, 331.
Wood (Pre-Mill.), **III.** 169.
Woodhouse, **I.** 548, **II.** 39, 195, 472, 687, **III.** 177, 372.
Woods, **I.** 76, **III.** 204.
Woodward, **II.** 193, **III.** 195.
Woolley, **I.** 60.
Woolman, **II.** 446.
Woolsey, **I.** 699.
Woolston, **I.** 54.
Wordsworth, **I.** 382, **II.** 322, 334, 625, 628, 646, 741, **III.** 300, 367, 430, 498.
World's Salvation, The, **III.** 256.
Worman, **I.** 488, 540, **III.** 78.
Worsley, **II.** 66.
W. R. D., **II.** 207.
Wright, **III.** 147.
Wünch, **III.** 347.
Wycliffe, **I.** 123–4, **II.** 678,
Wynn, **II.** 727, **III.** 53.

York (*Archb. of*), **I.** 94.
Youman, **III.** 509.
Youmans, **II.** 727.
Young, **I.** 74.
Young (B.), **III.** 271.
Young (Christ of His.), **III.** 535.

Zanchius, **II.** 673.
Zeno, **III.** 549.
Zeisius, **I.** 21.
Zeltner, **II.** 191.
Ziethe, **I.** 686, **III.** 23.
Zimmerman, **II.** 643.
Zion's Herald, **I.** 540.
Zöckler, **I.** 138, **II.** 249, **III.** 498.
Zollman, **I.** 85, **III.** 497.
Zoroaster, **II.** 155.
Zurich, Divines of, **II.** 679.
Zwingli, **I.** 124–5, 527, 635, 667, **II.** 216, 672, 679, **III.** 105.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

The numbers I. II. III. denote the volumes, and the figures refer to the pages indicated.

Abecedarians, **I.** 55.
Ability of God, **II.** 522–3, 552. See Power, Faithfulness.
Abomination of Desolation, **II.** 650.
Abrahamic Covenant, **I.** 293, etc. See Covenant.
" " essential, **I.** 292, 295, 338, etc., **II.** 137, 144, 444, **III.** 132, 244, 257, 309, etc., 369, 383, 561, 565.
" " and kingdom, **I.** 285, etc. See Cov., Kingdom.
" " perpetuity of, **I.** 214, etc. See Cov., Kingdom, Theocracy.
" " renewed, **I.** 322, 329. See Cov., the New.
Abraham's History, **III.** 432, 492.
Abuse, personal, **III.** 231–2.
Accommodation theory, **I.** 198, 459.
Acts, The, **III.** 358.
Accountability, **III.** 529. See Responsibility.
Adam, Second, **I.** 572, 614, **II.** 129, 157, 348, 486, 488, **III.** 557.
" " destiny of restored, **II.** 467.
" " dominion of, **I.** 572, etc., **II.** 142, 195, 487–8, 581.
Adam's Colony, **II.** 112, 468.
Adoption, **I.** 211, 403, **II.** 237, 259, **III.** 368.
Advancement in knowledge, **I.** 16.
Advent, First, **I.** 152, **II.** 342, **III.** 418, 419.
" First and Second, **I.** 242, 282, 365, 385, 626, 671, **II.** 166, 169, 176, 184, 187, 197, **III.** 79, 218, 312, 423, 529, 575.
Advent, Second, **III.** 59, 61, 245, 299, 377, 398.
" " apost. teaching, **I.** 471, etc., 478, **II.** 17, 71, 161, 316.
" " denied, **I.** 444, 461, **II.** 166, 343, **III.** 134–5, 141–2, 160, 165–6, 187, 242, 258, 300, 425, 527, etc.
" " Early belief in nearness, **I.** 183, 470, 472, 641, 695.
" " explained, **I.** 473, etc., **II.** 318. See Interval Stages.
" " interval in, **II.** 318, 328, 331, 338. See Interval Stages.
" " and kingdom, **II.** 562, **III.** 382, 422, 426. See Kingdom, Theocracy, Reign, etc.
" " and the millennium, **III.** 98.
" " and Mt. Sinai, **III.** 18, etc., 302, 305.
" " nearness of, **I.** 471, 477, **II.** 170, 186, 218, 316, 319, 331, **III.** 97, 100–1, 102–6, 119, 132–3, 141, 159, 167–8, 180, 182, 384, 424. See Signs.
" " necessary for salvation, **III.** 316, 352–4, 395, 423, 425, 503, 520, 528, etc., 539, 574, 586. See essential.
" " opinions, **II.** 164, etc., 168, 343.
" " and overthrow of Jerusalem, **II.** 34.
" " permanent, **II.** 342. See

Perpetuity of Kingdom, etc.
Advent, Second, personal, I. 569, 570, 674, II. 76, 86, 139, 156, 164, 180, etc., 189, etc., 208, etc., 217, etc., 347, 365, 410, 412, III. 59, 305, 377, 384–5, 528. See Visible.
" " perverted, II. 165, 220. See spiritualized, death, unbelief, etc.
" " Pre-Millennial, II. 161, etc., 167, 174, etc., 194, 342, 514, III. 345. See Judgeship, Judgment-Day, Reign, Kingdom, Earth renewed, First resurrection, etc.
" " precious, I. 249, 340, 385, 467, 477, 580, 695, II. 74, 155, 160, 167, 196–7, 388, 402, 411, 444, 513, 590, 598, 735, 737, 777, III. 141, 167–8, 170, 218, 309, 312, 314, 316, 319, 326, 330, 354, 384, 449, 451–2, 457, 528–9, 539, etc., 575–6. See Hope, Kingdom, Theocracy, Salvation, Redemption, etc.
" " prominency of, III. 167, 299, etc., 310, 313, 315, 317, 321, 354, 381, 384, 529.
" " refreshing and restitution, II. 463–4–5.
" " spiritualized, III. 179, 300, 527, etc. See death, perversions, unbelief, etc.
" " stages of, II. 315, 318, 331–2, 418, 700, III. 18, 102, 113, 133, 159, 160, 164, 302, etc., 305, 307.
" " and time, III. 96, 308. See Chronology, Time, Signs.
" " visible, III. 182, 299, etc., 305. See personal, visible.
" " world's conversion, III. 136, 172, 190–1, 381. See Conversion of the world.
Adventists, III. 11, 114. See History of the Doctrine.
" Seventh-Day, I. 536, II. 79, 323, 602–3, 575, III. 142, 163–4, 211, 263, etc., 339.
Advents, two future, II. 190.
Advocates, Pre-Millennial, I. See History of Chiliasm in Vol. 1, p. 450, etc., and III. 116, 135, 151, 153, 179, 194–5, 199, 200, 232, 238–9, 248.
Advocates, Jewish, III. 408–9. See Jewish belief.
Agag, III. 403.
Age and ages, II. 408, 411, 412, 425.
Age, end of the, II. 420, etc., 424, III. 587.
" evil, III. 184, 188.
" Father of the coming, II. 426.
Ages, King of, II. 411, 412.
Age and resurrection, II. 422.
" Solomonic, II. 524.
Ageda, III. 425.
Agrarian Law, the, III. 596.
Agreement in outlines, I. 491.
Aiōn, meaning of, II. 421, 424, 514.
Air theory, the, II. 532–3.
Albigenses, I. 324, 521, II. 265, III. 174.
Alexandrian Interpretation, I. 51, 59, 338, 499, 507, II. 214, 398. See Interpretation.
" Philosophy, III. 187.
All, usage of, I. 379, II. 363, 511, 513, 549.
Allegorical interpretation, I. 50, 511. See Interpretation.
American Chiliastic advocates, I. 543.
Anabaptists, I. 44, 118, 342, 529, 532, 534, 552, 601, 639, II. 103, 203, 216, 573, 637, III. 11, 51, 70, 175, 270.
Analogy, III. 343, etc.
" of Faith, II. 512, 521.
Ancient of Days, the, III. 25–6.
Angel of the Churches, III. 378.
Angelic Brethren, I. 54.
" communication, III. 446.
" influence, II. 619, 620–1.
" rule, II. 598.
Angels, coming of, II. 176–7.
" fallen, III. 188.
" judged, II. 620.
" ministrations of, II. 618, etc.
Anglo-Israelism, II. 66.
Animals, deliverance of, II. 483, etc.
Ann Lee, I. 204, 552.
Anointed, God's, III. 540.
" Saints, II. 579, 582.
Anointing with oil, III. 390.
Anonymous Chiliastic writers, I. 547.
Antagonism, III. 231. See Perversions, Unbelief.
Anthropomorphism, III. 573.
Antichrist, I. 654, 682, II. 105, 183, 208, etc., 221, 326, 328, 377, 654–5, 656, 658, 668, 691, III. 134, 156, 160, 162, 188, 586.
" and army, II. 764–5.
" and cause of war, II. 759.
" characteristics of, II. 691, 698, etc., 712, 721, 728, 750, 758.
" destruction of, II. 713, 740, 766–7–8.

Antichrist, development of, **III.** 509.
" history of views, **II.** 670, etc., 680, etc., 690, etc.
" march of, **II.** 760–2.
" meaning of, **II.** 696–7.
" miracles of, **III.** 161, 163.
" personal, **II.** 679, etc., 718.
" power of, **II.** 712, 740, 751, etc., 765
" preparatory tendencies, **II.** 720, etc., 748, etc., 770.
" revelation of, **II.** 700, 750.
" to whom applied, **II.** 673, etc., 680, etc.
" various applications of prophecy, **II.** 683, etc., 687, etc., 691, etc.
" worship of, **III.** 161
Antiochus Epiphanes, **I.** 677, **II.** 249, 650, 656–7.
Apocalypse, the, **III.** 366, etc., 382, etc.
" canonicity denied, **III.** 367, 382.
" fulfilment of, **III.** 133.
" how interpreted, **II.** 715.
" interpretation of, **III.** 371, etc., 378, etc.
" reception of, **I.** 484, **II.** 264.
Apocryphal books, **I.** 446, 486, **II.** 236, **III.** 572, 669, 675.
Apologies, abject, **I.** 492.
Apologetics, concessions of, **I.** 188, 460.
Apology A. C., **I.** 532.
" for writing, **II.** 732–3, 738–9, 745.
Apostasy, **I.** 102, **II.** 689, 691, **III.** 119.
Apostles, how quote prophecy, **III.** 185.
" and Kingdom, **I.** 77, 433, 436, 438, 443, 445, 459, 471. See Kingdom, theocracy.
Apostolic attitude, **I.** 274, 280, 479, 695, **II.** 17, 19, 161.
" creed, **I.** 530.
" brethren, **II.** 676.
Apostoolians, **I.** 537.
Argumentation, how conduct, **III.** 243–4, see Preface.
Ark, the typical, **II.** 487.
Armageddon, **II.** 762–3, **III.** 24.
Armies, standing, **III.** 149.
" the two, **II.** 764–5.
Armillus, **II.** 218.
Articles, Smalcald, **I.** 532.
Arts and Sciences in Mill, **II.** 147.
Asceticism, **I.** 501.
Asiatismus, **I.** 425.
Asmoneans, **II.** 60.
Astronomical objections, **II.** 579, **III.** 562–3.
Assurance, **III.** 359, 475.
Assyrian, the, **II.** 714.
Athanasian Creed, **I.** 532.
Atonement, **III.** 437. See Christ's death, blood.
Augsburg Confession, **I.** 123, 531–2, 637, 666, **III.** 175, 176, 202–3.
Awake, usage of, **II.** 256, 258.

Babylon, **II.** 707, **III.** 142, 160, 272.
" Jewish return from, **II.** 59, 83, 89.
Balaam's prophecy, **III.** 401, etc.
Baptism of the Holy Ghost, **III.** 64, etc., 464–5, 598.
" of fire, **III.** 80, etc.
" of the Holy Ghost and fire, **II.** 595, 613.
" " " " " " limited, **III.** 81.
Baptist Confession, **I.** 531. See Bunyan's Confession.
Baptists, **I.** 687.
" Seventh-Day, **III.** 11.
" Faith of, **III.** 135.
Barbourism, **III.** 269. See Barbour.
Barchocheba, **I.** 469.
Barkers, **I.** 54.
Barren woman, **II.** 130, etc.
Battle of the great Day, **II.** 751, etc., 767, etc. See War.
Beaconsfield, Lord, **II.** 55, **III.** 148.
Beast, human government, **III.** 12, 15.
Beds, of Psl. 149 : 5, **II.** 615.
Belgic Confession, **I.** 531.
Begotten, the first, **II.** 183, 190, 257–8, 300, 303, 477.
Believer, characteristic of, **III.** 322.
Believers, **III.** 76, 78, 142, 271, 339.
" judgment of, **II.** 385, etc., 389, etc.
Berlin, **III.** 157, 201.
Bible, book for the people, **I.** 116. See Scripture.
" beginning and ending of, **II.** 434.
" to be reverently studied, **I.** 117.
" and science, the, **III.** 498. See Science.
Bigotry, **I.** 417, 465, 481, 550, etc., 635, 640, 653, **II.** 103, 226, 309, 333, **III.** 139, 142, 234, 261, 273–4, 275, etc., 327, 338–9, 378. See Charity, lack of.
Birth, usage of, **II.** 257, 259, 300, 477.
" future, **III.** 80.
Blessings forfeited and restored, **I.** 106, 626, **II.** 128, 141, etc., 146–9, **III.** 455, 586.
" future, **III.** 453, 455–6, 461, etc. See Spiritual and Temporal blessings.,
Blood of Jesus, **III.** 431.
Bockelson, **III.** 178.
Body, the, **II.** 320.
" resurection of, **II.** 228, etc., 236, 239, 250, 304, 308.
" " " denied, **II.** 230, 272.
" spiritual, **III.** 464.
Bohemian, Prot., **I.** 521.

Bourignan, Antoinette, I. 54, 74.
Bozrah, III. 22, 24.
Brethren, the (Dunkards), I. 536.
Bride, the, II. 132, 324, III. 39, 301, 305.
Brooklyn, III. 138, 157.
Brothers, R., II. 112.
Büchnerism, III. 291. See Büchner.
Bunyan's Confession, I. 536, 687. See Bunyan.

Cabala, I. 48.
Call of the Gentiles, I. 211, 223, 392, 394, 396, etc., 399, 402, 404, 408, etc., II. 68, III. 526.
Camisards, III. 70, 270.
Canaan, no type, III. 61.
Canon, the, III. 363–4.
Captive, usage, II. 254.
Carcass, the, II. 320.
Carnality, charge of, II. 343, 436, 443–5, 540, 571, 604, III. 80, 229, 230, 450, 460–1, 556, 589.
Catastrophism, II. 428–9.
Cathari, II. 676, III. 74.
Catholic Apostolic Church, I. 536, 554, II. 317, 324, 568, III. 28, 78 271.
Cedars, II. 580.
Cerinthus, I. 443, 465–6, 485, III. 232.
Changes, future, III. 29. See Blessings, Mill., New Heavens and New Earth, Reign, etc.
Charity, I. 10, II. 226.
" lack of, III. 139, 142, 144, 234, 274, 378. See Bigotry, Persecution.
Chastening, why, II. 590, 744.
Chicago, III. 138, 157.
Child-bearing, future, II. 146.
Children of the Day, II. 410.
" " God, II. 298.
" saved, III. 262.
Chiliasm, III. 326. See Chiliastic history, Millennium.
" founded on the Covenants, I. 326. See Covenants.
Chiliastic history, I. 450, 458, 461, 465, 480, etc., 490, etc., 494, etc., 498, 513, 524, 545, 554, 641, 644, 665.
Chiliasts, apostles, I. 267, 443, 449, 494, 497,
" early church, I. 318, 324, 365, 449, 458, 462, 480, 490, 494, etc., 498, etc., II. 161, etc.
Christadelphians, I. 480, 537, II. 45, 278, 621, 634, 674, III. 11, 142, 260, etc., 339.
Christ, ability of, III. 72, 182, 354, 359, 366, 395, 411, 473, 514, etc., 533, 564. See power of,
" All in all, III. 579, 601.
" appearance of, II. 560.
" army of, II. 764, 765.
" body of, III. 578.
" controverted, I. 467.
Christ, Church and the, I. 596. See Church.
" David's Son, III. 370–1, 537, 557, 559, 565, 570. See Davidic Covenant.
" Davidic relationship retained, I. 339, 346, 352, 359.
" death of, I. 383, III. 420, 438, 480–3, 564, 571.
" Deliverer, III. 182–4, 188, 194, 209, 210, 213, 214, 294, 359, 420–1, 429. See temporal deliverer.
" dishonoring of, III. 543, 552, 577, 589.
" divine, I. 539, etc., 562, etc., II. 187, III. 354, 356, 415, etc., 420, etc., 424, 483, 530, etc.
" divine-human, I. 560, etc., 565, II. 123, 199, 633, 700, III. 415, etc., 447, 467, 477, etc., 512, 530, etc., 537, etc., 552, 593, 601.
" enemies of, I. 579, 766. See Antichrist.
" essential, I. 78, 333.
" explained, III. 349, etc, 448. See meaning.
" exalted, III. 403, 531–2, 542, 552–3, 602. See greatness, power, etc.
" faithfulness of, III. 542.
" foreknowledge of, III. 485.
" Fulfiller, I. 329, II. 152.
" greatness of, I. 31, II. 582, 766, III. 427, 438–9, 533, 553, 576. See divine, perfect, reign, etc.
" greatness of His work, III. 536, 550, etc. See Creation, Redemption, Restitution, Salvation, etc.
" glorified in His Saints, II. 596.
" glorious, I. 249. See appearance, exalted, etc.
" honoring of, III. 214, 535, 552, etc.,
" the Hope, III. 310, 578–9.
" humanity of, III. 538–9, 541, 552–3, 555, 557, etc., 560, 564–5. See divine-human.
Infallible Head, III. 550–1.
" inheritance of, II. 773, III. 34, 37, 49, 463, 586. See Davidic Covenant, David's throne, Inheritance of Jesus.
" interest in His person, III. 130, 153, 295, 349, 356, 513, 535, 537, 554.
" Jewish King, I. 427, II. 94, 205.
" Kingdom of, I. 414. See inheritance, kingdom, theocracy, Davidic Covenant, reign, etc.
" King of kings, II. 578. See supremacy, etc.
" kingly office not in ministry, II. 597–8.
" knowledge of time, III. 93–4.
" law, and the, I. 373.
" lives of, III. 560, 580.
" marriage of, III. 39, etc. See Marriage.

Christ, meaning of, I. 385, 441, 447, 569, II. 180, 556–7, III. 228, 350, 567, etc., 569, etc.
" miracles of, III. 472–3, 479, 514, 521.
" miracle-working, I. 91, 93, 97, II. 156. See supernatural, miraculous, power, etc.
" name perverted, III. 515, 568, etc.
" no writer, I. 271–2, 627.
" offices of, III. 584.
" perfect, I. 584, 701, II. 307, 431, 433, 536, III. 315, 354, 356, 364, 411, 419, 420 438, 454, 475, 479, 514, etc., 531, 533, 535, 550, 596, 600. See divine, infallible head, etc.
" personally present, II. 533, 561, 563, 766. See Son of Man, visibility, epiphany, parousia.
" power enforced, when, III. 172, 453, 529.
" pre-existence of, III. 538.
" Priest, II. 601, etc.
" Priesthood of, III. 191, 456.
" prophet like Moses, III. 28, 426.
" Redeemer, III. 449, etc., 453–4, 529. See redemption, salvation, curse, evil, etc.
" reign of, II. 504, 532, 536, 561, 768, III. 213, 370, 539, 543, 548, 550, 553, 555, 586. See supremacy, Theocratic King, Theocracy, kingdom, Reign of the saints, etc.
" reign perpetual, II. 630, etc. See kingdom, Theocracy, Perpetuity, etc.
" rejoicing, III. 602.
" representative of God, III. 537, etc.
" Restorer, I. 250, II. 76, 78, 152, etc., 186, 195, 307, 430–1, 466, 468, 472, 486, III. 454, 473, 478–9, 494, 515. See Blessings forf. and restor.
" resurrection of, III. 438, 482–3, 514, 523, 553.
" sinless, III. 533, etc. See perfect.
" sin-removing, I. 105, 333. See curse, evil, etc.
" Son of Man, I. 559, 565, etc., 577, 581–2, 614, II. 167, 180, 223, 327, 341, 346–7, 351–2, 355, 374, 563, III. 553–4. See humanity.
" Stone, the, I. 676, 683.
" supernatuial king, I. 80, 91, 559, 569, 700, II. 177, 188, 307. See Supernatural, Miracles.
" supremacy of, II. 618, 767. See King of kings, reign, etc.
" Theocratic King, I. 231, 281, 351–2, 376, 447, 559, 563, 565, 597, 701, II. 557, 560, 766, III. 353–4, 366, 403, 429, 434, 438–9, 447, 456, 475, 479, 512, 514, etc., 517, 530–3, 537, 541, 550, 558, 564, 570, 575, 601–2. See Theocracy.
Christ, temporal deliverer, I. 273, 384, II. 766, etc., III. 425–6, 457, 542.
" truthfulness of, III. 58, 421, 519.
" unchangable, II. 600, III. 538, etc., 557, etc.
Christological question, the great, III. 512, etc., 537, etc.
Christs, false, II. 758.
Christian system, II. 638.
Christianity, changes of, I. 45.
" misinterpreted, I. 78. See Unbelief.
Chronology, II. 657, 665, 717, etc., 774, III. 92, etc., 96, etc., 98, etc., 102, etc., 104, 197, 308. See Time.
" and Sabbatism, II. 459.
Church, Broad the, III. 122, 207, 281, 468.
" Christian, I. 405, 447, 499, 513, 592, 596, 609, 665, 671, 684.
" complete, II. 602.
" and Daniel, I. 672, etc.
" divisions of, III. 196.
" early doctrine of, I. 318, 365, 624, 641, 644, 658, II. 348, 511, 525, 539, III. 38–9, 58, 132, 169, 171, 199, 222, 229, 239, 245, 249, 250, 282. 296, 311, 317, etc., 322, 345–6, 413, 461, 486, 502, 523, 534, 572, 579, 585.
" establishment of, III. 526. See Dispensation, design of, and Church Christian.
" God of, I. 536.
" government, III. 169, 335.
" Headship of, I. 596.
" Kingdom, and, I. 359, 363, 389, 431–3–7, 469, 471, 499, 505–8, 582–9, 591–3–6, 601–6–9, 611, 613, etc., 618, 632–4–8, 641–4–7, 653–5, 662, 671, 684, 690, II. 17, 20, 23. 27, 30–2, 35, 39, 56, 90, 94, 100, 106, 558, III. 180–1–2, 223, 253, 282, 296. 370–1, 392, 422, 483, 503, 575, 582–3–5.
" Kingdom, and, not synonymous, I. 632, III. 585. See the preceeding and Kingdom.
" name of, III. 196.
" New Jerusalem, and, III. 39, 40.
" preparatory, III. 381, 383, 545. See Dispensation, design of.
" present condition of, I. 617, 634, 638, 652, 687, II. 163, 493, III. 117, 118 119, 183–4, 188, 202, 210, 282, 335, 381, 383, 498.
" State of, I. 395, 653, II. 775, III. See present condition.
" State, and, I. 207, 240, 266, 348,

651, 663, II. 97–8, 117, 119, 576, 600, 607, 651, 663, III. 14, 16, 83, 338, 462, 545, 551, 582, 591, 595–6.
Church theocracy, no, III. 545. See Theocracy.
" unbelief, and, III. 116, 217, etc., 248, etc. See Unbelief, Perversions, Contradictions, etc.
" wealth of, III. 129.
Churches, the seven, III. 377, etc.
Cincinnati, III. 157, 201.
City of God, I. 300, 508, 615. See Augustine.
Cities, condition of, III. 131, 138–9, 144, 156–7, 196, 201.
Clay and iron, III. 131.
Cleansing of the Sanctuary, II. 115.
Clericalism, I. 640, III. 378.
Cloeter, II. 112,
Clouds, in, II. 314.
" of heaven, II. 175, 187, 223.
Colony, Adams, II. 112, 468.
Colonization schemes, II. 88, 468.
Colossians, III. 363.
Coming One, the, II. 183, 191, 561, III. 384–5.
Commentators, Chiliastic, I. 545, etc,
" testimony of, II. 213.
Commission, the, III. 191–2.
Communism, II. 724, III. 154.
Comparative theology, III. 504–5.
Concessions, futile, II. 510.
" to unbelief, I. 14.
Condemnatory, doctrine, II. 196.
Conditional, promises not, II. 47, 74, 79.
" prophecy, how, I. 176, II. 48.
Confederation, II. 326.
" the last, II. 105, 752, 754, etc., 757, etc., 760, 763, III. 13, 160, 162, 205, 293–4, 394, 396. See War, Persecution, Trouble.
Conferences, Chiliastic, I. 554, III. 130, 153, 169, 204, 222, 263, 327, 332.
Confession of Peter, I. 441.
Confessional exclusiveness, I. 128, 526, 532.
" teaching, I. 492, 518, 527, 530, 532.
Confessions, III. 197, 281–2. See Creeds.
Conflagration of Peter, II. 506, etc., 510, etc.
Conflict of Bible and Science, III. 498, 507–9.
Conscience, I. 134, III. 285.
Consolation, Day of, II. 464.
" of Israel, II. 143, 299.
Constantine, I. 505.
Continuist interpretation, III. 372.
Contradictions, II. 170, 218, 252, 268, 271–2, 293, 302, 514, 551, III. 103–4, 182, 187, 193, 311, 575. See Perversions.
Controversial writers, I. 547–8.
Controversy, God's, II. 742, etc.
" with Jews, no, III. 350. See Jews.
Conversion, Jewish, I. 281, II. 189, 463, 471. See Jews.
" of the world, I. 394, II. 155, 732, 736, 745, 751, 770, III. 119, 134, 136, 143. 171, etc., 186, etc , 189, etc., 196, 202, 210, 212, etc., 255–6, 308, 381, 587.
" " " " and the early Church, III. 171–3.
" " " " and the Reformers, III. 175–7.
" " " " and the Sec. Advent, III. 172, 136, 190–1, 381.
Corinthians, Epistles of, III. 362.
Cosmos, II. 33.
Council, of Rheimsburg, II. 672.
Councils, I. 518.
Covenanters, II. 778.
Covenant, Abrahamic, III. 420. See Abrahamic.
" Davidic. See Davidic Covenant.
" how changed, I. 324, 333–4.
" foundation of faith, II. 444, III. 132, 244, 257, 369, 383, 561, 564–5, 600.
" foundation of hope, III. 309, etc., 365, 383.
" kingdom based on, I. 285, 293, 325, 328, 334, 339, 348, 393, 422, 427, 504, 565, II. 53, 79, 161, 340, 346–7. See Davidic Covenant, Kingdom.
" manner of fulfilment, III. 420, 453.
" misconceptions of, I. 330, 340, II. 83.
" New, the, I. 322, etc., 329.
" with the Jews, II. 657, 664.
Covenants and Gospels, III. 350.
Creation delivered, II. 178, 466, 477, 479, etc., III. 587. See New Heavens and New Earth, etc.
" of man, III. 496.
" of woman, III. 431, etc.
" six days of, II. 458, 469.
Creator, the, III. 510, etc.
Creature, the, II. 480, etc.
Credibility of Scripture, III. 467.
Credulity, I. 452, II. 99, 239, III. 291. See Faith of unbelievers.

Creeds, Augsburg Conf., I. 123, 531–2, 637, 666, III. 175, 176, 202–3.
" Apostolic, I. 530.
" Apology, A. C., I. 532.
" Articles, of Smalcald, I. 532.
" Athanasian, 532.
" Baptists, I. 531. See Bunyan.
" Belgic, I. 531, II. 678.
" Bohemian, II. 678.
" Conf. Helvitia, I. 532, III. 194,
" Conf. of Edward VI., I. 531, 534.
" Catechism of Edward VI., I. 531.
" Cath. Apost. Church, I. 536.
" Free Chr. Church (of Italy), I. 536.
" Nicene, I. 530.
" Second Adventist, I. 536.
" Westminster, I. 531–2, II. 220, III. 175–6, 202–3.
" value of, I. 124, etc.
" how enforced, I. 129, 530.
" teaching of, I. 493, 530, 532.
" Kingdom, and, I. 616.
Criticism, higher and lower, III. 470.
Cross, efficacy of, III. 455–6.
Crowned, saints when, II. 579.
" Paul, II. 579, 582.
Cup of the New Test., I. 327.
Curry, I. 204.
Curse, the, II. 488, etc., 492–3, 517. See Sin, Evil.
" effects, III. 128, 152, 184, 206.
" deliverance from. See Blessings forfeited and restored, Evil removed, Creation delivered, New Heavens and New Earth, Paradise, etc.

Damasus, I. 520.
Daniel, III. 490.
Daniel's resurrection, II. 248.
Darbyites, I. 536, III. 271. See Believers, Plymouth Brethren.
Darkening of the sun and moon, III. 151, 164.
Darkness, usage of, II. 256.
Dates, chronological, II. 657, 665, 774, III. 99, 100, 102, 104. See Chronology, Time.
Darwinism, III. 291. See Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall.
David El-Roy, II. 203.
" key of, II. 205.
David's Son. See Christ, Davidic Cov.
Davidic age, II. 524.
Davidic Covenant, kingdom based on, I. 285, 313, 339, 565, 578, II. 51, 71, 341, III. 224, 244, 296, 370–1, 565.
" " how changed, I. 316, 338, 347, 427, 499, 509, 514, 571, 583, 649, II. 67, 79, 83, 90, 95, 99, 161, 199, etc., 204, etc., 340, 347. See Spiritualizing, etc.
Davidic throne, Jesus inherits, I. 199, etc. 347, etc., 355. See, Inheritance, Covenant, etc.
" " restoration of, I. 190, 270, 279, 282, 339, 343, 347, 350, 365, 372, 420, 422, 429, 441, 557, 565, 570, 578, 580, 598, 613, 627, II. 49, 51, 58, 76, 78, 138, 179, 189. 200, 341, 347, 439, 466, 532–3, 713, 744, 760, III. 43, 49, 51, 296, 354, 359, 392, 399, 422, 425, 460–2, 517, 528, 575.
" kingdom and the theocracy identical, I. 234, 344, 348, 390, 395, 563, 565, 664, II. 97, 120, 124, 187, 349. See Theocracy and Kingdom.
" " divine nature of, I. 348, 563, 565, 699, II. 75, 269. See Spiritual.
" " no type, II. 524.
Day, battle of the great. See Battle.
" children of the, II. 410.
" of Consolation, II. 464.
" of Judgment, II. 358, 362, etc., 365, 367, etc., 383, 409, 516, III. 245, 586.
" the dark, III. 68, 164.
" literal, fulfilment, II. 686, 717, 755–6.
" the Lord's, III. 95.
" of the Lord Jesus, II. 87, 183, 190, 210, 368–9, 409, 410, III. 587.
" man's, II. 412.
" morning of the, II. 87, 316, 414, etc., III. 587.
" scriptural usage of, I. 476, II. 365–6, 368.
" year, II. 686, 717, 755–6.
Days, the Ancient of, III. 25–6.
" end of, II. 424.
" of heaven, II. 466.
" the last, II. 195, 301, 336, 367, 421, 423.
" of Noah and Lot, III. 112, 123–4, 133, 185, 297.
" prophetical, III. 99.
" six of creation, II. 458, 469.
" twenty-three hundred, III. 99.
" twelve hundred and sixty, II. 755–6.
Dead, extravagantly eulogized, II. 395.
" resurrection of. See Resurrection.
Death of Jesus, efficacy of, III. 420. See Cross.
" " " sublimity of, III. 480–1.
" an enemy, II. 170–2, 244, 306, 395, III. 59, 61, 300, 312.

Death not the coming of Jesus, II. 170–3, 395.
" introduced, II. 158, 228, III. 501.
" in Millennial age, II. 148.
" shadow of, III. 389.
Degrading, II. 552.
" of the Christ, II. 638, 743. See also, Christ, dishonoring of.
De Gerson, John Charlier, I. 56.
Degrees, II. 389, 391, 610. See Rank, Kings, Reward, etc.
Definitions of the kingdom, I. 39, 147, 181, 195, 690.
Deliverer. See Christ deliverer, Temporal deliverance.
Deliverance and the morning, II. 416.
Deluge, extent of, III. 501.
Demoniacal possessions, III. 79.
Demonology, III. 145.
Denominations, some in, Chiliastic, I. 537, 542, etc., 553.
Depravity, human, great, I. 13, 144, 161. See Antichrist, persecution, war, wickedness.
" future, II. 748, 750, 772.
Design, proof from, III. 510.
Desire, the, of women, II. 652.
Destiny of the saints, II. 593–6, III. 72, 446–7, 591–3, 600. See reign, priesthood.
Destructionists, III. 269.
Detention of the saints, II. 394, etc., 397, etc.
Development theory, I. 113, 199, 339, 460, 598, 623, 642, 658, etc., III. 134, 143, 146, 156, 173, 183–4, 207–8, 227, 237, 257, 311, 346, 362, 370, 382–3, 484, 520, 560.
Devil, works of destroyed, III. 454.
Devils, doctrines of, III. 123.
Dew, usage, II. 418.
Differences, III. 272–3.
" in the Church, I. 634.
" of interpretation. See Interpretation.
" in view, I. 525.
Dignity of man, III. 434.
Diseases removed, II. 145.
Discernment, spiritual, I. 52.
Disciples, how preached the kingdom, I. 182, 253, 274, 443, 436, 438, 443, 445, 449, 471, II. 19. See Kingdom. Theocracy.
" knew the kingdom, III. 528. See Preaching.
Divine and Divine-Human. See Christ.
" Purpose, the, III. 287, 295–6, 340, 347, 371, 440, 454, 469, 475, 482, 487, 491, 493, 504, 515, 520, 593, 597, 600. See Covenant, Dispensation, Plan, etc.
Divisions of the Church, III. 196.
Dispensation, design of, I. 587, 590, 598, 600, 617, 635, 642, II. 203, 224, 227, 588, 590–1, 596, 778, III. 96, 181, 187–8, 192–3, 200, 204, 208–9, 211, 216, 238, 517.
Dispensation, future, II. 344, 367, 370, 407, 410, 423, etc., III. 31, 72, 120, 293–4, 456, 510, 585. See Day of the Lord Jesus, Judgment Day, World to Come, Restitution, Ages, etc.
Docetism, I. 501, II. 539.
Doctrine, advocates of our, III. 135. See His. of Chiliasm.
" basis, of I. 65–6, II. 19.
" condemnatory, II. 196.
" diversity of, I. 15. See Perversions, Differences.
" early Church, I. 318, 658, II. 19. See His. Chiliasm.
" early Fathers, III. 406–7. See His. Chiliasm.
" Jews. See Jewish belief.
" miracles, I. 101. See Miracles.
" necessary, III. 226.
" of the kingdom perpetuated, I. 480, 675, II. 124.
" " " " changed, I. 60, 147, 368, 370, 411, 423, 459, 499, 509, 513, 524, 598, 602, 605, 611, 621, 626, etc., 632, 638, 644, 647, 655, 659, 662, 685, 690.
" perversion of, I. 510, 511. See Perversions.
" progress of, I. 113, 658.
" religion, and, I. 111.
" our, a solvent of difficulties, III. 406, etc., 430, etc., 476, etc.
Domination of Gentiles. See Gentiles.
Dominion and the morning, II. 415.
" of the Second Adam, I. 572, etc., II. 142, 195, 487–8, 581.
Domitian and believers, I. 468.
Duchoborzius, I. 54, III. 70.
Dust, usage, I. 256.
Duty of Scripture students, I. 16.
" violated, III. 166.

Eagles, the, II. 320, 322, 580.
Early belief in speedy Second Advent. See Sec. Advent.
Earnest, the, III. 213, 287, 450.
Earth, desirable, II. 432, etc., 436, 444.
" and covenant, II. 432, etc., 434, 445, 516.
" destruction of by fire, II. 427, etc., 516, 521.
" " " " freezing, II. 428–9.
" inherited, II. 434, 443–6, 480, 501, 504, 514, 531–3, III. 38, 62, 585–6. See Inheritance, Reign, New Heavens and New Earth, etc.

Earth, perpetuity of, **II.** 427, etc., 513, etc. **III.** 587. See Perpetuity of the race and of the kingdom.
" " " advocates, **II.** 430, etc., 432, 445, 480.
" " " concessions, **II.** 430, 480, 516.
" place of the kingdom, **I.** 35, 348, 365, 402, 573, 643, 660, 669. **II.** 13, 33, 117, 124, 144–5, 156, 159, 251, 263, 305, 359, 570, etc., 547, etc., 596, 617, **III.** 32, 49, 51, 60, 62. See Kingdom, Reign, Inheriting, etc.
" redeemed, **II.** 432, etc., 437, 514. See Creation, Restitution, Evil, Curse, New Heavens and New Earth, and related subjects.
" renewed, **II.** 148, 178, 499, etc., 524, etc.
" smallness of, **III.** 562.
" usage, **II.** 497, etc., 499, etc.
East, kings of the, **II.** 764, **III.** 27.
" righteous man of the, **III.** 27.
" usage, **III.** 27.
Ebionism, **I.** 486, **III.** 40.
Eden, **III.** 51.
Eden no type, **III.** 61.
Edom, **II.** 62, 194, **III.** 22, 24.
Education, secular, **III.** 131, 158, 206.
Egypt (Matt. 2 : 15), **II.** 201.
Ekklesia, **I.** 594, 652, **III.** 196. See Church, name of.
Elect, complete, **II.** 542.
" gathering of, **I.** 412, 422, **III.** 120, 136, 224, etc., 329, 330, 333. See Dispensation, design of, First Resurrection, Reign, etc.
" Jewish nation, **I.** 207, 292, 392, etc., 399, 408, 416, 422, **II.** 42, 53, 48, 92, 95, **III.** 402, 471, 486, 595.
" meaning of, **I.** 401–2.
" qualified for what, **II.** 225.
" who pertain to the, **I.** 405–6–8, 417, **II.** 249, 587–9, 590, **III.** 58, 95, 120, 156, 196–7, 200, 431-2, 437, 457. See First-born, First-fruits, Reign, Priesthood.
Election, **II.** 49, 209, 392, etc., 401, etc., 404, 411, **III.** 368. See Elect, Gentiles, engrafting of, Jewish nation.
Elias, coming of, **II.** 565, etc.
Elijah, **III.** 20, 102, 162, 164, 303, 307.
" future mission, **II.** 87.
End, the, **II.** 296, 336, 411, 424, 741.
" of the age, **II.** 420, **III.** 587.
" of Days, **II.** 424.
" of time, **II.** 424.
" the time of the, **II.** 653, **III.** 97.
" the wonderful, **III.** 442, 454, 456, 469, 475.
End of the world, **II.** 420, etc., 424, 427–8, 492.
Endowments, **III.** 249.
Enemy, usage, **II.** 256.
England, **II.** 743, 778, **III.** 15, 139, 140.
Engrafting, **III.** 368, 486. See Elect, Gentiles.
" necessary, **III.** 309, 310, 424. See Elect.
Enlightenment professed, **III.** 229.
Enoch, Parables of, **I.** 570.
Ephesians, Epistle of the, **III.** 362.
Epiphaneia, **II.** 211.
Equality, **II.** 598.
Equity, God's vindicated, **II.** 597. See Imprecatory Psalms, Justice, Curse, etc.
Error, **III.** 276. See Extravagances, Perversions, etc.
" fruitful source of, **I.** 621, 645, 699. See Interpretation Spiritualistic.
Esau, **II.** 609.
Escape, who will, **II.** 323, 325, etc., 327, 331–2, 334.
Eschatology, study of, **III.** 135, 151, 321, 427.
" prominence of, **III.** 427.
Eternal life, how obtained, **II.** 386, 388–9.
" usage, **II.** 630.
Euphrates, **II.** 764.
Eutychian Theory, **III.** 539.
Evangelists, Chiliastic, **I.** 553, **III.** 141.
Everlasting kingdom, the, **I.** 675. See Kingdom, Perpetuity.
Evil age, the, **III.** 184, 188.
" ignored, **I.** 107.
" not necessary, **II.** 469.
" removed, **I.** 106, **II.** 141, etc., 145, 147–8, 156, 178, 434, 446, 466, 469, 479, etc., 483, etc., 488, 517, 535, 596, 775–6, **III.** 182–4, 425, 434–5, 455, etc., 464, 475, 501, 600. See Blessings restored, Curse, Creation, etc.
Explains Scripture, the kingdom, **II.** 108, 422, **III.** 388, etc.
Extravagances, **I.** 552, 677, 685, **II.** 99, 191–2, 197, 206, 220–3, 249, 252, 271–2, 282, 292, 323, 342, 345, 353, 433, 436, 444, 446, 506, 515, 517, 520, 531, 537, 552, 623, 658, **III.** 35, 38, 51, 53, 63, 70, 73–4, 88, 136, 140, 142, 152, 173, 183, 206, 274, 372–3, 378. See Perversions, Unbelief.
Ezekial's last chapters, **III.** 84, etc.

Failure, God makes none, **II.** 588, **III.** 544, etc., 589, 590, etc.
Faith, analogy of, **III.** 343, etc.
" " " how violated, **III.** 345.
" appropriating, **I.** 139, 333, 401, 416, 418, 692, **II.** 196, 328, 391.
" believers, of, **II.** 428–9, 522.
" early churches, of, **I.** 449, etc., **II.** 193, 348. See Church, early doctrine of, Chiliastic History, etc.

GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Faith, foundations of, III. 132, 222. See Covenants.
" justifying, III. 286.
" lack of in the Church. See Unbelief, Church, Perversions, Spiritualistic Interpretation, etc.
" lack of in the world. See Unbelief.
" lack of predicted, I. 290, 307, 329, 349, 520, II. 43, 186, 191, 486, 552, III. 217, etc., 221, etc. See Unbelief.
" not destructive to Science, I. 140. See Science.
" and reason, I. 137, 334. See Reason.
" responsibility of, III. 283–4.
" requisite, I. 272, 291, 316, 337, 415, II. 77, 87, 186, 196, 206, 236, 239, 263, 334, 769, III. 37, 47, 159, 214, 221, 243, 320, 358, 434, 475.
" and sight, II. 349.
" to be tested, III. 133, 165, 279, etc.
" of unbelievers, II. 428–9, 522.
" and works, III. 364–5.
Faithfulness of God, I. 387, 393, 416, 422, 581, II. 49, 53, 65, 71, 82, 85, 130, 135, 202, 229, 390, 427, 429, 431, 443, 522, 536, 552, 571, 577, III. 221, etc., 233, 411. See Oath of God, Power of God, etc.
Fallibility of man, I. 45. See Gentile domination.
Fall of man, III. 433. See Evil, Curse, etc.
False Christs, II. 758.
Fanaticism, III. 231–2, 318.
Fasting on Sunday, II. 458.
Fathers, Apostolic and Christian, I. 443, 451, 452, etc., 472, etc., 480, etc., 487, 490, etc., 494, etc., 512, 515, II. 214, 221, 348, III, 346.
Father's house, III. 53, etc.
" Coming. See Ancient of Days.
Fatalistic theory, II. 469.
Feast of trumpets, II. 452.
Fifth-monarchy men, I. 44, 533, 552, 639, III. 11, 178, 270.
Fig-tree, III. 110, 126.
Figurative interpretation. See Interpretation.
" perversion of, I. 186, II. 75, 99, 200.
Finite and the Infinite, III. 540.
Fire, baptism of, III. 80, etc.
" Jewish belief, II. 428, 506, etc., 510.
" future, II. 177, 377.
" of Matt. 25 : 41, III. 245.
" painting, II. 427–9, 520.
" Pre-Millennial, II. 377, 380.
" of Peter, II. 428, 506 etc., 510 etc., 519.
" Worship, II. 758.
" usage, III. 80.
First, usage, II. 269, 272.
First-born, II. 140, 269, 315, 318, 446, 544, 608–9, 618, III. 432, 458.
First-fruits, II. 315, 318, 319, 322, 329, 380, 413, 542, 561, III. 24, 185, 432.
Flagellants, II. 676.
Flock, small, III. 196.
Foreign advocates, Chiliastic, I. 544, etc.
Forever, usage, I. 578, II. 344, 538.
Forfeited blessings restored, III. 455. See Blessings, Evil, Restitution, etc.
Foundations of doctrine and faith and hope. See Covenant.
France, III. 139, 140.
Frank, Sebastian, I. 54.
Fratricelli, II. 676, III. 74.
Freedom, human, I. 148.
Freeman tragedy, The, III. 252.
Free Italian Church, II. 637.
Free Religionists, III. 283.
Freezing of the Earth, II. 428–9.
French Prophets, I. 74.
French Emperorship, II. 643, etc.
Friends of Light, I. 434.
Fruitfulness, II. 143.
Fulfiller. See Christ.
Fulfilment, delay of, II. 203.
" future, III. 72, 221, 298, 391.
" literal, II. 488, etc. See Literal Fulfilment.
" of prophecy, I. 69, 166, 176, 309, 693, II. 48, 175, 541, 769, 773, III. 252–3, 224, 360, 414, 419, 421, 429, 453, 489, 492, 526. See Prophecy, Covenant, etc.
" time of, III. 391.
Fulness, II. 67, 75.
Future, as present, I. 415.
Futurist interpretation, III. 374.
" view, II. 686, 718, etc., 755–6.

Gates of Hell, II. 258, 299.
Gathering of the elect, I. 412, 422, III. 120, 136, 224, etc.
" of saints, I. 412, II. 320, 331, III. 96. See Dispensation, design of, Call, Engrafting, etc.
Gatherings, the two, II. 763.
Genealogies, I. 352.
Generation, I. 381.
Generations, successive, II. 551, 606. See Race, Perpetuity, Kingdom, etc.
Genesis, III. 492, etc., 498, etc.
Gentiles, calling of, I. 68, 211, 223, 392, 394–6, etc., 399, 402–4, 408, etc., III. 526.
" domination of, I. 629, 681, II. 96, 495, 497, etc., 773, etc., III. 104, 586, 597–8.
" dominion of, how portrayed, II. 639. See also Governments, how estimated, character of, etc.

Gentiles, engrafting of, **III.** 486. See Call, Keys, etc.
" high-minded, **III.** 118, 230, 408, 424.
" participate in Theocratic blessings, **I.** 232, 393. See Kingdom, Theocracy, Race, World-dominion, Reign, Jewish Supremacy, etc.
" rashness of, **I.** 329, 333, 395, 398, 416, 425, 615, **II.** 57, 73, 78, 91. See Interpretation Spiritualistic.
" times of, **I.** 243, 406, 419, **II.** 60, 70, 87, 115, 459, 472, 624, 639, 774, **III.** 12, 104, 185, 336, 505.
Germany, **III.** 15, 138, 140.
Gideon, **II.** 768.
Glasgow, **III.** 201.
Glorification, **III.** 457.
Glorified. See Christ, Saints.
Gnostic influence, **I.** 499, 501, **II.** 121, 231, 234, 283, 400, 436–7, **III.** 40.
Goal, the pre-determined, **III.** 429, 454. See Divine Purpose, End, Kingdom, Reign, etc.
God, personal revelation of, **III.** 438, 494, 505, 510, 550, 590, etc., 595, etc. See Ancient of Days, Second Advent, Coming One, etc.
" justified, **III.** 295, 391–2. See Divine Purpose.
God's anointed, **III.** 540.
" controversy, **II.** 742, etc.
Gog and Magog, **II.** 529, 695, 709–711.
Gospel, John's, **III.** 354.
" Kingdom, **I.** 607.
" of the kingdom, **I.** 151, 182, 254, 259, 509, 607, **III.** 137, 200, 202, 219, 228–9, 231, 310, 506, 522.
" Luke's, **III.** 353.
" Mark's, **III.** 352–3.
" Matthew's, **III.** 350–1.
" types, **I.** 630. See Types.
" a witness, **III.** 117, 137, 141, 169; 192–3, 197, 200, 204.
Gospels, the, **III.** 349, etc.
" and Covenants, **III.** 350.
" origin of, **I.** 197, **III.** 501–2, 523.
" unity of, **III.** 356–7, 358–9.
Government, Church, **III.** 169.
" forms of Church, **I.** 638.
" moral, **III.** 280–2, 285, 510.
" a perfect one, **III.** 548, etc., 550.
" of other worlds, **III.** 443, etc.
" of God, no failure, **III.** 544, etc., 589, 590, etc.
Governments, character of, **III.** 12, 13, 16, 550.
" destiny of, **III.** 12, 13, 16, 238, 589, 591, 597–8. See Gentile domination.
Governments, how estimated, **III.** 11, etc., 16. See Beast.
" necessity of, **III.** 11–13, 16.
" ordained, **II.** 778–9, **III.** 12, 13.
Grace, God's wonderful, **II.** 588–9. See Christ, Saints, Inheritance, Kingdom, Reign, etc.
Greatness of the Christ. See Christ.
" of the Kingdom. See Kingdom.
Greek Church, **I.** 648.
Groves and Goodnight, **III.** 269.
Guests, the, **III.** 305.

Hackett, **I.** 601.
Hades, **I.** 654, **II.** 401–2.
Haictites, **II.** 187.
Halle, **III.** 139.
Hand, **II.** 580.
Harmony Society, **I.** 537.
Harvest, **II.** 21, 26, 171, 173, 319, 322, 330, 334, 381, **III.** 185, 382.
Hatred, **III.** 144, 153–4, 165, 235, 238, 253, 293, 325, 330–1. See Bigotry, Persecution.
Head, infallible, **III.** 550–1.
Headship of the Church, **I.** 596.
Heads, the seven, **II.** 643, etc., 646.
Healing of the nations, **II.** 528, 530, 547–8.
Heart, power of the, **III.** 280.
Heathenism, ancient restored, **II.** 728, 730, **III.** 161, 281.
Heaven, figure, **II.** 12.
" Kingdom of, **I.** 195, 283, 364, **II.** 11, 16.
" passages referring to, **II.** 11.
" the third, **I.** 668, **II.** 13, 399, **III.** 312.
Heavenlies, **II.** 13. 580.
Heavens, usage, **II.** 497, 499, etc., 502, 766, **III.** 24–5.
" and Earth, new, **I.** 686, **II.** 148, 178, 499, etc., 542, etc., **III.** 587.
" " " " and early Church, **II.** 504, 525–6.
" " " " perpetuity of, **II.** 503.
Heavenly country, **II.** 15.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, **III.** 363.
Heirs, saints, **III.** 13, 305, 437. See Inheritance, Earth, Kingship.
Hell, usage, **II.** 256, 258.
" of Edward's, **II.** 433, 437, 444, 515, **III.** 265.
" gates of, **II.** 258, 299.
Helvitic Confession, **I.** 534.
Hereditary evil, **III.** 144.
Heresy, charge of, **I.** 443. 453, 457, 465, 481, 483, 498, 512. 515, 520, 535, 551, **III.** 214, 225, 231–2, 250, 253, 450.

Heresy hunting, I. 12, 466, 481. III. 274.
Hidden ones, the, II. 326, 760, III. 24.
Hinderer, the, II. 328, 701, etc.
Hiding of saints, II. 325.
" truth, II. 732.
Historical connection, III. 343, 347.
History of Abraham, III. 432, 492.
" of Jesus, a, III. 349.
" of Antichrist. See Antichrist.
" of Chiliasm, I. 450, 458, 461, 465, 480, etc., 490, etc., 498, 513, 524, 554, 641, 644, 665.
" " " chronological, I. 494, etc.
" " " concessions, I. 484, 486, 498.
" " " errors opposed, I. 512.
" " " general belief, I. 554.
" " " Gnostic and Alexandrian influence, I. 499. See Gnostic influence.
" " " Papal influence, I. 513.
" " " Reformation, I. 524.
" " " revival, I. 555.
" " " survival, I. 553.
" and prophecy, I. 172, 340.
" of the world, III. 427, etc., 583, 595.
Hoker, I. 74.
Holland, III. 139.
Holy Ghost, the sect of, II. 647.
Holy Land, the, III. 33.
Holy Spirit, I. 624, II. 79, III. 64, etc. See Baptism of the Holy Ghost.
" " sin against the, III. 79.
Honor, God's, III. 544. See Oath, Faithfulness, etc.
Honoring God's word, III. 167.
Hope, the Blessed, I. 249, 340, 385, 467, 477, 580, 695. II. 74, 155, 160, 167, 196–7, 388, 402, III. 105, 116, 167–8, 170, 268, 295, 310, 312, 314, 317, etc., 319, 329, 384, 449.
" Christ, the. See Christ.
" Covenant the foundation of. See Covenant.
" the Kingdom, the, III. 549. See Kingdom.
" the One, III. 309, etc., 588.
" its preciousness, III. 314, etc., 319.
" substituted, III. 310, 311.
Horeb, III. 20.
Horn, II. 93, 579.
" the little, of Daniel 7, II. 684, 693, 695.
Horns, the three, II. 692, 718.
" the ten. I. 672, II. 693, 696, 707, 718, 752–5, III. 149.
Hour, II. 301, 366.
House, II. 496.
" usage, III. 54–5, 56–7.
" Father's, III. 53, etc.
Humanitarianism, II. 726, 728. III. 121, 124, 133–4, 205, 207, 238, 283, 288, 293–4, 509.
" worship of, II. 727–8, 730, 752. See the preceding and Antichrist.
Humanity of the Christ. See Christ.
" exalted, II. 597, 613, 720, 728–9.
Humanity to be elevated, III. 549.
Humility affected, II. 702, III. 254, 267.
Hussites, II. 627.

Idumea, II. 761, III. 22.
" desolation of, II. 483.
Ignorance, wilful, III. 116, 292.
Image, the, II. 706, 746.
" of God, II. 348, 581.
" worship, future, II. 664, 706, 729, 746, etc., III. 161, 163. See Antichrist.
Immanuel, III. 542.
Imprecatory Psalms, II. 110, etc., 736, 771, III. 391.
Incarnation, I. 571, III. 438, 553–4, 557–9.
Infallible Head, II. 193, 605, III. 550–1.
Infallibility, I. 120.
Infants, resurrection of, II. 597.
Inheritance of Jesus, I. 302, 321, 344, 582, II. 95, 199, etc., 201, etc., 347, 773, III. 34, 37, 49, 463. See Davidic Covenant, Throne, Kingdom, etc.
" " " not destroyed, II. 428, 437–8, 509, 515. See Perpetuity, Oath, etc.
" of the Patriarchs, I. 294, 298, 309, 413, 585, II. 52, 96, 263, 444, 516, 530, 534.
" of the saints, I. 303, 310, 322 392, 402, 414, 584, 600, II. 13, 227, 263, 330, 370, etc, 374, 376, 533–4, 577, etc., III. 62, 457, 460. See Reign, Kingship, Priesthood, etc.
" not typical, I. 298, II. 52. See Canaan no type, Eden no type, Kingdom no type, etc.
" unity of promise, I. 294, etc.
Inheritances devised, II. 447.
Inheriting and the advent, II. 528.
" the earth, II. 434, 436, 439, etc., 443–6, 480, 501, 504–5, 529, 530–3, III. 38, 62, 585–6. See Inheritance of Jesus, of the Patriarchs, of the saints, and also Reign, Kingdom, etc.

Inspiration, I. 68, II. 19, 150, III. 467.
" definition, I. 73.
" natural, I. 75, 118, 203, III. 204–5.
" proof of, III. 215, 467, etc., 480, etc.
" and signs, III. 167.
" verbal, I. 74.
" views of, III. 486–7.
" Congregation, I. 74.
Inspirationists of Iowa, I. 74, 118.
Intermarriages forbidden, I. 231.
Intermediate state, I. 413, 643, 669, II. 227, 394, etc., 400, etc.
" " early Church view of, II. 398,400.
" " Jewish view of, II. 399.
Internationalism, II. 724.
Interpretation, accommodating, I. 59, 372.
" allegorical, I. 50, 511.
" Alexandrian, I. 51, 59, 338, 499, 507, II. 214, 398.
" Apocalypse, of the, II. 715.
" Consistent, II. 521, III. 105, 290, 296, 321. See Literal.
" Continuist, III. 372.
" differences of, II. 622, 626, 658, 683–4, 687, 690 etc. See Interpretations varied, etc.
" figurative, II. 486–7.
" inferential, I. 620.
" Jewish, I. 50, 287, 464.
" literal, I. 45, 47, 290, 310, 344, 448, 625, 665, II. 85, 98, 100, 165, 169, 190–1, 311, 447, 488, etc., 571, 581, III. 180, 222–3, 233, 240–1, 244, 252, 274, 290, 296, 311, 392, 410, 422, 503, 525, 550, 562,
" moral, I. 58.
" mystical, I. 58, 370, 502, 598, 656, 659, II. 138, 204.
" Origenistic. See Origen, Spiritualistic.
" preterite, III. 371.
" proof of. See Literal Fulfilment and Interpretation.
" rash, I. 174, 372, 511, II. 99, 106, 108, 150. See Perversions, Extravagences, etc.
" Spiritualistic, I. 52, 60, 118, 187, 196, 204, 300, 314, 338, 345, 348, 351, 357, 368, 370, 425, 429, 435, 448, 502, 511, 530, 575, 578, 583, 585, 593, 598, 619, 623, 627, 632, 649, 656, 660, 665, 685, 692, II. 12, 34, 40, 45, 63, 82, 91, 98, 100, 164, 168–9, 199, 204, 206, 212, 219, 221, 252, 309, 312, 340, 350–1, 488, etc., 506, 581, 619, 625, 700, 771, III. 57, 64, 173, 179, 219, 223, 240, 244, 252, 274, 290, 296, 383, 397, 410, 422 etc., 447, 453, 461, 464–5, 453, 523, 562, 568, 572.
Interpretation, varied and contradictory, III. 46, 56, 63, 85, 103, 229, 232, 274, 296, 370, 374–5, 378 etc., 383, 392, 397, 424. See Varied, Spiritualistic.
Interval, III. 96–7, 102, 133, 149, 150, 160, 163, 168, 302–3, 307, 374, 387. See Second Advent, Stages.
Investiture of the Son of Man, I. 577, II. 587.
Iron and clay, mixture of, II. 704.
Irvingites, I. 74, 536. See Irving.
Israel, consolation of, II. 143, 299.
Israel, meaning of, I. 399, II. 67, 96.
Israel's Identification Society, II. 66.

Jacob's trouble, II. 737.
James, Epistle of, III. 364.
Jehoshaphat, II. 761.
Jerusalem and Antichrist, II. 760–1.
" future, III. 32, etc., 56.
" identification of, III. 35–6, 55.
" league against, II. 112.
" not typical, III. 32, 61.
" under Gentiles, III. 35.
" New, II. 144, III. 39, etc.
" " and the Church, III. 40, etc.
" " literal, III. 41, etc.
" " marriage of, III. 39, etc., 52.
" " millennial, III. 52, 59.
" " and old united, III. 50, 58.
" " on earth, III. 49.
" " size of, III. 47.
" " splendor of, III. 45.
"Jewish," I. 424, 457, 459, 461, 463, 465, 472, 504, 533, 621, 626, 630, 641, 674, 691, II. 139, 219, 260, 311, 361, 512, III. 142, 230, 296, 370, 408, etc., 412, etc., 490.
" belief, I. 183, 260, 277, 297, 308, " 315, 364, 409, 435, 445, 459, " 464, II. 50, 72, 90, 98, 100, " 106, 170, 185, 187–8, 199, " 219, 362, 367–8, 510, 585, " 631, 669, 734, III. 83, 86, " 107, 186, 350, 359, 408, 410, " 415, etc., 417, etc., 422, etc., " 450, 502, 518, 568–9, 585, " 600.

Jewish belief, how sustained, I. 190, 287, II. 90, 100. See Covenant, Oath.
" " preservative, I. 189.
" church, I. 604.
" churches, I. 486.
" concessions, III. 425.
" Hope, III. 309.
" interpretation, I. 50, 287, 464, II. 585.
" King. See Christ, David's Son, etc.
" Kingdom, I. 424, 427. See Kingdom, Theocracy, Jewish Restoration, etc.
" nation, elect, I. 207, 292, 399, 408, II. 48, 92, 95, III. 402, 471, 486, 595. See Elect, Election, Engrafting, Covenant, etc.
" " exaltation of, III. 307, 402, 595. See Supremacy, Greatness of, etc.
" " colonization of, II. 111.
" " conversion of, II. 75, etc., 81, 463, 471, III. 126, 185, 303, 408–9, 574.
" " greatness of, II. 95–6, 101, 114, 138.
" " increase future, III. 402.
" " interest in the holy land, III. 126.
" " kingdom tendered to the, I. 207, 356, 362, 375, 377, 390, 396–7, II. 42. See Kingdom, Postponement, etc.
" " king of rejected, I. 376. See Sin of.
" " kingdom rejected, I. 375, 390. See Kingdom, Postponement, Theocracy.
" " and miracles, III. 473–4.
" " and the morning, II. 417.
" " objections of, I. 625, II. 359, etc., III. 408, etc.
" " perpetuation of, I. 215, 351, II. 56, 59, 138.
" " preaching first to, I. 356. See Call.
" " present power of, III. 148.
" " protection of, II. 114.
" " restoration of, I. 336, 354, 388, 422, 427, 588, II. 48, etc., 55, etc., 63, etc., 75, etc., 85, 106, 133, etc., 189, 252, 380, III. 36, 148, 161, 244–5, 345, 368, 410, 424, 586.
" " riches of, II. 143.
" " sin of, III. 421, etc., 426.
" " and the Spirit, III. 75.
" " supremacy of, II. 92, 114, 617, III. 402, 422, 586. See Exaltation of, Greatness of, etc.
Jewish nation and Theocracy inseparable, I. 231, 233, 387, II. 97. See Theocracy, Elect, etc.
" " times of, II. 80. See Sabbatism.
" " tribulation of, II. 57, 60, 73, 85, 663, 731, 736–7, 760, 766–7, III. 113, 126, 186, 303.
" " type, no, I. 212, 406, II. 52.
Jews, antagonism to Gentiles, I. 504.
" conversion among the, III. 408–9.
" " of, I. 281, II. 75. See Jewish nation.
" " ceased, I. 468, 509, 627.
" first converts of, I. 467.
" modern, Chiliastic, I. 551, II. 91.
" " unbelief of, I. 288, II. 54, 91, 340, 493, 507, III. 126, 148, 417, etc., 421, etc., 424, etc., 566. See Unbelief of.
" lack of candor, III. 424.
" no controversy with, I. 467, 641, II. 510, III. 350, 413.
" not ignorant of kingdom, I. 186, 205, 253, 274, 280–3, 287, 356, 364, 375.
" not in kingdom at First Advent, I. 185, 390.
" rebukes to, I. 184.
" unbelief of, I. 380, 420, III. 240, 408, etc., 410, etc., 417, etc. See modern unbelief.
" usage of phrases, I. 195, 198, 308, 323, 364, 446, 683, 691, II. 36, 420. See Jewish belief, World to Come, Day, etc.
Joachimites, II. 677
Joanna Southcote, III. 401.
John, the Baptist, and his hearers, I. 260.
" " " and his ministry, I. 262.
" " " not ignorant, I. 256.
" " " and his preaching, III. 533, 585.
" " " standing of, I. 253, 257.
" of Leyden, I. 342, II. 637, III. 178.
John's Gospel, III. 354.
" Epistles, III. 365.
Jonah, sign of, I. 380.
Jordan, type of what, II. 393.
Joshua's miracle, III. 395, 473.
Jubilee, III. 99, 182.
Judaizers, I. 205, 463, 466. See Jewish.
Jude, Epistle of, III. 365.
Judge, concessions respecting, II. 359.
" how ignored, II. 361, 364.
" Jesus as, I. 579, II. 177, 352–3, III. 586.
" " " necessary, II. 358, 364.
" meaning of, II. 353, etc., 357, 583, 590.

Judge, perversion of, II. 352, 357, 360, 362.
" Jewish view of, II. 585.
Judges, II. 353, 392.
Judgeship, joyful, II. 353, 369, 370.
" and kingdom, II. 352, etc.
Judging, apostles, II. 583, 585–6.
Judgment, I. 619, 583.
" antecedent, II. 283, 306, 374–5, 382, 385, 392.
" of believers, II. 385, etc., 389, etc.
" day of, II. 358, 362, etc., 365, 367, etc., 383, 409, 516, III. 245, 586.
" day of, early belief, II. 362, 368–9, 372, 383.
" the general, II. 221, 372, 381.
" the last, II. 367, 372.
" of quick and dead, II. 392.
" saints, II. 578, 583–4, 610, III. 81. See Kings.
Judgments, II. 358, 373.
" future, III. 81, 185–6–7, 189.
Jumpers, I. 54.
Justice of God, II. 736, 743–4,
" future time of, III. 189.
Justified, God, III. 295, 391–2.

Karaite, I. 446.
Key, an important, I. 622.
Keys, the two, I. 408.
King of the ages, I. 411, 412.
" of kings, III. 578. See Christ,
" and servants, parable of, II. 24.
Kingdom and Acts, III. 358.
" adaptation of, III. 240, 278, 297, 407, 475–6, 515, 529, 537.
" adopted, why, I. 198.
" Advents, I. 242.
" Advent, linked to the Second, I. 244, 365, 387, 414, 424, 467, II. 74, 509, 562, III. 318, 328.
" analogy, and, III. 343, etc.
" angels, and, II. 618, etc.
" Antichrist, and, II. 668. See Antichrist.
" Apocalypse, and, III. 366, etc., 382, etc.
" Bible, structure of the, III. 477.
" blessing, a, II. 145, 304, 466–7, 480, 591–5, 613, III. 449, 453–4, 455, etc., 464, 475, 555, 589, 600.
" blessings of, I. 220, 564, II. 466, 480, 591, 613, III. 240, 279, 316, 327, 460. etc., 475–6, 515, 578, 588–9, 590–1, 595–7, 599. 600.
" Christ, and, III. 228, 350, 449, etc., 454, etc. See Christ, Inheritance, Reign, etc.
" Church, and, III. 180–2, 218.
" " not the Christian, I. 609, 612, 615, 618, 632, etc.
Kingdom, Church not the visible, I. 647, 662.
" " not the invisible, I. 655, 662.
" " and State, union of, II. 607–8.
" commencements of, various alleged, I. 44, 368.
" conception of, proper, III. 132, 220, 225, 237–8, 286, 288, 461–2.
" conditional, III. 519.
" continued, why not, I. 222, 419.
" controversy with Jews concerning, no, I. 280, III. 485.
" covenanted, I. 285, 290, 293, 325, 328, 331, 334, 339, 348, 390, 393, 422, 427, 504, 565, II. 48, 53, 79, 161, 340, 346–7, III. 371, 461–2, 527, 545, 550, 582, 584–5, 600.
" covenants based on. See Covenants, Abrahamic and Davidic.
" Davidic Kingdom, the, I. 234, 565. See Davidic Covenant, Inheritance, etc.
" death of Jesus, and, I. 429.
" defined, how, I. 39, 147, 181, 195, 690.
" definite, I. 195, 664, II. 504, 513, 532–3.
" delay in, II. 127, 203, 589.
" delivering up of, II. 188, 635.
" described, how, I. 248.
" desirable, III. 588–9. See blessings of, etc.
" determined, I. 34. See Covenant, Divine Purpose.
" dignity of, I. 34, 393, 598, II. 99, 304.
" disciples not ignorant of the. I. 274, II. 19, III. 58.
" doctrine based on Scripture, I. 68.
" doctrine changed, I. 60, 147, 368, 370, 411, 423, 459, 598, 602, 605, 611, 621, 626, etc., 632, 638, 644, 647, 655, 659, 662, 685, 690. See Interpretation, Spiritualistic, His. of Chiliasm, etc.
" doctrine of, perpetuated, I. 480, 675, II. 124.
" doctrine substituted, I. 204, 368, 370, 411, 445, 459, 469, 603.
" downfall and restoration foretold, I. 240, 419, 420.
" earnest, an, I. 218.
" earth, pertains to the, I. 35, 348, 365, 402, 573, 643, 660, 669, II. 13, 33, 117, 124, 144–5, 251, 263, 305, 359, 504, 513, 532–3, 596, III. 25, 32, etc., 49, 51, 60, 62, 457, 463, 465, 548, 556,

569, 583. See Inheriting, Renewal, Reign, etc.
Kingdom, earthly kingdom, no, I. 220. See God-derived.
" enforces the doctrine of God, I. 37, II. 75.
" elect nation, offered to the, I. 207, 377, 397, II. 42.
" Epistles, and the, III. 361, etc.
" everlasting, I. 675, II. 503, 513, 590, 599, 630, etc. See Perpetuity, Stability.
" failure, no, I. 664, II. 125–6, 207, III. 37, 477, 544, etc., 582, etc., 584–5.
" faith, and, III. 288.
" fallen, when, I. 250.
" Father, given by the, I. 577, II. 587.
" fundamental, I. 272, 565, 664.
" fundamentals of, III. 597, 600. See Covenants.
" future, I. 367, 369, 379, 382, 402, 413, 419, 440, 467, 471, 590, 598, 621, 691, II. 117, 224, 374, 466, 513, 558, 562, 574. See also Postponement, Second Advent, Pre-Mill. Advent, etc.
" future, spiritual, III. 80, 460, etc. See Spiritual, Kingship, Priesthood, Reign, Blessings, etc.
" Gentiles, and, I. 232, 396. See Gentiles, call of the, Dispensation, design of, etc.
" given to whom, I. 386, 390, 392, 396, 402, 408, 412, 415, 422, 567, 600, 602, II. 13, 177, 227, 263, 330, 374, 376, 574. See Elect, First-fruits, Heirs, Kings, etc.
" given to whom first, I. 230.
" given by Scripture, I. 110.
" glory of, III. 210, 214, 240, 430. See Greatness and glory of, Power, supremacy, King, etc.
" God-derived, III. 16, 25, 348, 393, 462, 527, 545. See Earthly, no, Covenant, Supernatural.
" goal, the, III. 341, 344, 366, 454–5–6, 475, 491, 495, 504, 576. See Divine Purpose, End, Reign, Theocracy realized, etc.
" Gospel kingdom, not a, I. 607.
" Gospel of the, III. 137, 219, 228.
" Gospels, III. 349, etc., 502.
" greatness and glory of, II. 503, 589 592, etc., 595–6, III. 44, 218, 288, 456, 464–5, 528, 550, 553, 555, 589. See Supremacy, World-dominion, King, Reign, etc.
Kingdom, Heaven of, I. 195, 283, 364, II. 11, 16.
" heaven, not in the third heaven, I. 668.
" holy, III. 461, 463, 465, 600. See Spiritual, Kings, Priesthood, Christ, etc.
" holiness, and, II. 608.
" Hope, the, III. 310, 311, 549, 578, 589, 595.
" humbling, III. 237, 279, 288, 292.
" idea of to be realized, I. 223, 664.
" " perverted, I. 423, 603, 605, 665, II. 124, 340. See Substitutions, Perversions, etc.
" importance of, I. 29, 272, II. 304. See Fundamental, Covenants.
" infallible rule, I. 219, II. 780, III. 550–1. See Perfect, Christ.
" inherited, III. 457, 485, 585. See Inheritance, Heirs, Kings, Reign, etc.
" initiatory and completed, III. 597.
" inspiration, and, III. 467, etc.
" Jewish, I. 424, 427, III. 369, 370, 422, 460.
" " belief, III. 422, etc. See Jewish faith, etc.
" " boast of, I. 321.
" " Church, not the, I. 604.
" " king subordinate, I. 228,
" " nation, tendered to the, I. 356, 362, 375, 390, 396.
" Jews, virtually abandoned by the, I. 226.
" Jerusalem, and, III. 34, etc.
" John, not established under, I. 262.
" " preaching by, I. 253, 256, 260.
" Judges, not ended with, I. 228.
" known, well, I. 181, 364.
" meanings applied to. See Meanings given to.
" leading, III. 428, 468, 475, 480, etc., 495, 582, etc., 590, etc., 592, etc., 595. See Importance of, prominency of, extent of, etc.
" miracles, and, III. 473–4.
" Mt. Sinai, and, III. 17, etc.

Kingdom, mysteries of, I. 141.
" nationally nigh, I. 363, 368, 372, 375, 389, 574. 590.
" nearness of, I. 252, 266, 368, III. 92, etc., 95, etc., 105, etc.
" necessary, II. 129.
" New Test., how introduced in the, I. 181.
" non-existence, when in, I. 250, III. 546.
" not changed, III. 574, 584–5, 589, etc.
" not set up at the First Advent, I. 366, 370, 396, 421, 440, 466, 558, 590. See Postponement, Second Advent, Pre-Mill. Advent, etc.
" obscurely, some things revealed, I. 148, 275, II. 16.
" Old and New Tests., relationship of to the, I. 161.
" Oneness of, I. 245, II. 632, III. 60, 222, 463–4.
" pattern, no, III. 15, 592. See Type.
" perfect, I. 123, 128, 225, 304, 466–7, 480, 570, 589, 590, 776, 778, 780, III. 288, 415, 430, 455, 461, etc., 537, 540, 548, etc., 582, etc., 591, etc., 595, 597, 599.
" perpetuity of, I. 233, 565, II. 630, etc.
" personal relationship to the, I. 32, 393.
" perverted, III. 520, 574, 592. See Substitutions, Commencements, Perversions, etc.
" phases of, I. 283.
" postponed, I. 379, etc., 412, 419, etc., 421, 433, 586, 590, etc., II. 48, etc., 161, etc., 224, 668, III. 13, 242–3, 356, 454, 484–6, 503, 517, 519, 523, 527–9, 544, 546, 585. See Postponement.
" power, one of, I. 251, II. 503, 570, etc., III. 68, 82, 456, 464.
" preached, I. 182, 443.
" preaching of the apostles concerning, I. 433, 436, 438, 443, 445, 459, 471, 475, 478, II. 17, 19, 574.
" priesthood, and its, II. 601, etc., 607, etc.
" promises relating to, I. 342, 471, 687, II. 94, 128, 142, 144. See Blessings, Kings, etc.
" prominency of, I. 32. See importance of, goal, fundamental, covenanted, extent, etc.
Kingdom, prophecy, and, I. 195, 664.
" providence, and, III. 340.
" punishments, and, III. 598.
" purest and firmest rule, I. 571, II. 123, 570, 590. See perfect, infallible, power, greatness, etc.
" reason, and, III. 288, 348.
" reasonable, II. 126.
" realization of, I. 34, 664, 687, II. 503, 524, 526. See Blessings, Redemption, Restitution, Reign, Salvation, etc.
" redemption, and, II. 604, III. 240, 343, 383, 435, 475–6.
" rejected, III. 297, 527.
" removed, I. 237. See Restoration, etc.
" repentance, and, III. 419.
" restored, I. 248, 256, 393, 413, 467, 565, 575, 687, II. 92, 117, 123, 199, 466, 630, 639, III. 366, 383, 399, 454, 460–1, 477–8, 517, 544, 582, 585. See Kingdom set up, when, Davidic throne and kingdom, Earth, Reign, Second Advent, Perpetuity, etc.
" restored under Ezra, not, I. 237.
" sacrifice, and the, III. 455–6. See death.
" sacrifices, and, III. 83, etc.
" safeguards around the, I. 229.
" Scripture explained by the, II. 108, III. 388, etc.
" seeking the, III. 388.
" set up, when, I. 419, 470, 577, 590, II. 48, 55, 75, 102, 152, 161, 227, 244, 362, 404, 409, 414, 42 , 461, 473, 494, 499, 524, 622, 639, 668, 731, III. 17, etc., 484–5, 486, 517, 567, 590, etc. See Kingdom, nearness of Second Advent, restored, etc.
" sin opposed to the, I. 105.
" Spirit, and the, III. 64, etc.
" Spiritual, and, II. 607, etc., 611, 615, III. 64, etc., 80, 460, etc., 591. See Spiritual, Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Priesthood, Theocracy, etc.
" splendor and glory of, III. 44, etc., 383, 463–4, 465, 477–8, 528, 530, 539, 590–1, 595. See glory of, supremacy, world dominion, etc.
" stability of, II. 630, etc., III. 456, 542, 589, etc., 593, 600. See Everlasting, Perpetuity, etc.
" study, demands careful, I. 36, 151.
" subordinated, I. 31, 597.
" substituted, III. 187, 212, 218,

etc., 222, 231, 233, 296, 350, 352, 460–5, 484–5, 527, 545–6, 559, 562–3, 583. See doctrine substituted, idea perverted, discordant views, doctrine changed, varied, etc.
Kingdom, sudden coming of, III. 23.
" supernatural allied to the, I. 80, 97, 365, 676, II. 33, 80, 84, 89, 105, III. 28, 64, etc., 70, 82, 456, 463, 473. See Miraculous, Supernatural.
" supernatural, necessity of, I. 81, II. 53, 80, 89, 99, 105, 144, 147, 152, etc., 156, 479, III. 71, 73, 184, 220, 238–9, 287–9, 295–6, 341, 347, 440, 464–5, 472, 477, 479, 488, 503, 506, 514, 521.
" supremacy of, II. 570, etc., III. 11, etc., 591. See World-dominion, greatness of, Jewish supremacy, etc.
" type, no, II. 524, 526.
" unbelief in the, III. 217, etc., 225, etc., 238, 242, 286, 484–5, 486–8, 502, 520, 528, 546, 572, 575. See substituted, doctrine changed, etc.
" understood, can be better, I. 154.
" unity of, III. 338, 584, 595. See Oneness of.
" value of, I. 33. See Blessings, glory, perfect, etc.
" varied, III. 233. See substituted, changed, etc.
" views of discordant, I. 8, 66, 372, 649, 665, 668, 677. See definitions, substituted, doctrine changed, perversions, unbelief in, etc.
" visible, I. 351, 364, 369, 564, 569, 573, 575, 641, 648, 651, 655, 660, 674–5, 683, 692, II. 33, 44, 46, 92, 97, 117, 123, 204, 340, 343, 348, 504, 513, 532–3, III. 43, etc., 460, etc., 463, 465, 528, 544–5, 548–9, 552, 582, 584, 587.
" want, a felt, III. 476.
" Word, alone in the, III. 225. See given by Scripture, Covenants, based on, etc.
" work, and Christ's, III. 449, etc., 454–5.
" world-dominion, a, III. 460, 463, 547, 596–7. See supremacy of, Jewish supremacy, Gentile domination, Reign, etc.
Kingdoms, the ten, I. 672, II. 693, 696, 707, 752, 754–5, III. 149.
Kings, saints, II. 577, etc., 590, etc., III. 30, 58, 71, 238, 457. See Reign of the saints.
Kings, saints, degrees of rank, II. 591. See Reward.
" " limited, II. 590. See First-born, First-fruits, One hundred and forty-four thousand.
" " matchless power of, II. 595.
" " on earth, II. 603. See Kingdom pertains to the earth, Inheritance, etc.
" " qualified, II. 590–1, III. 81, 457.
" " perpetually such, II. 603. See Kingdom, perpetuity of.
" " priesthood of, II. 71, 215, 464. See Priests.
" " representatives of Jesus, II. 596.
" of the East, II. 108, 764.
Kingship perverted, II. 597–8.
Kings from Abraham, II. 577.
Knowledge and evil, III. 144, 158.
" future, III. 439.
" increase of, III. 127, 130, 135, 150, 153.
" personal, I. 401.
" requisite, III. 226.
Kosmos, II. 431, 514.

Labadie, I. 54.
Laborers in the Vineyard, parable of, II. 24, 389.
Laodicea. See Churches, seven.
Lamb, marriage of the. See Marriage.
Language, future, II. 145.
Last days, II. 336.
" judgment, II. 367, 372.
" times, II. 337.
Latter days, II. 337.
Law, agrarian, the, III. 596.
Law and the Christ, I. 373.
Lawgiver. See Judgeship, Revelation, Reign.
Law, reign of, III. 511.
" unchangeable, III. 205.
Lazarus and the rich man, parable of, II. 399.
Lead, Jane, I. 74, 118.
Leaven, parable of the, I. 114, II. 22, III 190–1.
Lee, Ann, I. 114, II. 139.
Letter killeth, I. 53, 62, 332.
Lexicographers, testimony of, II. 212, 220.
Literal fulfilment, I. 167, 174, 243, 249, 290, 314, 317, 332, 335, 343, 349, 364, II. 187, 190, 204, 346, 348–9, 350, 488, 769, II. 36. See Literal Interpretation, Fulfilment, Future, etc.
" interpretation. I. 45, 47, 290, 310, 344, 448, 625, 665, III. 85, 98, 100, 165, 169, 190–1, 311, 447, 488, etc., 571, 581, III. 180, 222–3,

233, 240–1, 244, 252, 274, 290, 296, 311, 392, 410, 422, 503, 525, 550, 562.
Literal interpretation, importance of, I. 57, 130.
" " meaning of, I. 47, 191, 193, II. 571.
" " true standard, I. 49, 290, 314, 332, II. 190.
Lived, usage of, II. 267.
Lives of the Christ, III. 483.
Locust Army, II. 766.
Lord's day, III. 95.
" prayer, I. 531, 618, 643, 689, 695, II. 436, III. 186, 391.
" " misappropriated, I. 694–5, II. 37.
" supper, II. 62.
" table, III. 132.
Lollards, I. 521.
London, III. 157, 201.
Loss endured, II. 389.
" how suffered, III. 135, 229, 277, 328.
Love for the appearing, III. 135, 229, 277, 328.
" of God, II. 159.
" influence of, III. 204, 327.
Loyola, III. 77.
Luke's Gospel, III. 353.
Lutherans, faith of the, III. 135.

Maccabees, II. 60.
Magians, II. 236.
Magog, II. 529, 695, 709–711.
Mammon, worship of, III. 129.
Man-child, II. 259, 285.
" the Son of, I. 559, 565, etc., 577, 581–2, 614, II. 167, 180, 223, 327, 341, 346–7, 351–2, 355, 374, 410, 563, III. 553–4. See Christ David's Son, humanity of, etc.
" " meaning of, I. 566, II. 167.
" " kingdom given to the, I. 577, 581, II. 223.
" " sign of the. See sign.
" ordained, III. 555, 563–4.
Man's day, II. 412.
" fall, III. 433.
Manifestations of the sons of God, II. 592.
Mansions, the, III. 57.
Maranatha, I. 472, II. 198.
Mark's Gospel, III. 352–3.
Marriage, how used, II. 131, etc., 203, III. 42, 52, 301–2.
" how degraded, II. 537, 540.
" of the Lamb, II. 171, 173, 182–3, 190, 270, 324, 346, 527, 529, III. 27–8, 43, 299, etc.
" supper, III. 45, 301, etc.
Married wife, the, II. 131, etc.
Martyrs, future, II. 738, etc., 741, 745 757–9, 770, III. 387. See Persecution, Antichrist.
" resurrection of the, II. 286.
Massachusetts, III. 201.
Materiality, III. 43.
Matthew's Gospel, III. 350–1.
Mathias's apostleship, II. 585.
Meanings given to the kingdom, I. 39, 44, 60, 66, 147, 181, 195, 204, 368, 370–2, 411, 423, 445, 459, 469, 598, 603–4–7–9, 612, 615, 618, 626, 632–4–8, 641, 644, 647, 655, 659, 662, 665, 668, 690. See Kingdom substituted, varied, definitions, doctrine changed, unbelief in, etc.
Melchisedec, II. 602.
Memorial, I. 296.
Men of understanding, III. 70.
Mennonites, I. 537.
Merciful God, III. 234.
Messages, the two, II. 160.
Messiah. See Christ.
Messiahs, false, III. 130–1, 155–6.
Metaphor, II. 486.
Methodists, faith of the, III. 135.
Michael, II. 655, 657.
Michaleans, I. 537, 554.
Middle wall of partition, I. 213, 405.
Midnight, III. 94, 304.
" cry, III. 307.
Millennial age, nearness of, III. 98. See Sec. Advent.
" blessings, II. 142, etc., 150, 244, 453-6, 462, 466-7, 480, 503, 508, 591, 613, III. 240, 279, 316, 327, 460, etc., 475–6, 515, 578, 588–9, 590–1, 595–7, 599, 600. See Reign, Kings, Priests, Creation, Restitution, etc.
" doctrine, no novelty, I. 19. See History.
" predictions, III. 190.
" seasons, II. 528.
Millennium, Augustinian, I. 515, 522, 525, 527, 615, 667, II. 149, 163, 628, III. 173, 178.
" Brown's, II. 153, III. 183.
" Burdick's, II. 283.
" Bunyan's, I. 536.
" Bush's, II. 287, III. 174.
" Constantinean, I. 505, 529, 534, II. 149.
" Davis's, III. 165.
" Joachim and Fratracelli, I. 522.
" Neander's, III. 183.
" Origenistic, III. 173. See Origen.
" Popish, III. 174, 178. See His. of Doctrine.
" Priest's, II. 303.
" Reformers, III. 174–7. See His. of Chiliasm.

Millennium, Waldegrave's, II. 292, III. 183.
" Whitby's, I. 373, 525, 528, 532-4, 547, III. 150, 153, 155, 163, 215-220, 265, 284, 378, 772, III. 134, 170, etc., 172-3, 177, etc., 179, 181, etc., 197, etc., 215, 236.
" various views, I. 529, II. 157, 265, 282, 622, etc., 624, 628, 728, 732, 736, 746, 751, 770-2, 777, III. 35, 203-6.
" location of the, II. 622, etc.
" order of the, II. 627, etc.
" perverted, II. 141, etc., 149, 153, 155, 157, 265, 271, 626-7. See Bush, Waldegrave, etc.
" spiritual, III. 174, 178-9.
" and Jewish restoration, II. 628. See Jewish nation.
" and the morning, II. 418. See Day of the Lord Jesus.
Millerism, I. 523, 536, II. 55, 363, III. 114, 166-7, 211, 267.
Ministers, unbelief of, III. 250. See Unbelief of the Church, Signs.
Ministration of angels, future, II. 618.
Ministry, condition of, III. 185, 193.
" not kings, II. 597-8.
Minority, no test, I. 493.
Miracle, Joshua's, III. 395, 473.
Miracles, I. 88, 97, 365, 676, III. 472. See Supernatural, Kingdom.
" cessation of, III. 74-6.
" Christ, of, III. 472, 479, 514, 521.
" definitions of, I. 91.
" and doctrine, I. 101, 276.
" earnests, I. 97, II. 79. See signs.
" essential to the kingdom, I. 81, 89, II. 53, 80, 82, 89, 99, 105, 144, 147, 152, etc., 156, 196. See Kingdom, supernatural allied with and necessity of, Supernatural, etc.
" future, II. 595, 738, 740, 757-8, 760, III. 64, 71, 161, 163, 184, 390. See Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Creation, etc.
" and Jewish nation, III. 473. See Jewish nation, conversion and restoration of.
" Patristic, III. 76-9.
" signs, are, I. 90, 96, II. 145. See also miracles of Christ.
" solution of, I. 100.
Missionaries, III. 188, 197, 307.
" Chiliastic, I. 553, III. 200, 204, 212, 235-6, 330-1-2-3.
Missions, III. 187-8, 200, 204, 211, 235-6, 330, etc.
Mohammedans, II. 236, 704.
Moment, a, III. 435.
Monkery, I. 517.
Montanists, II. 640, III. 31.
Moon, usage, II. 452.
Moravians, I. 537, II. 676.
Moral obligations, III. 510.
" qualifications, III. 496, 556.
Morelschiki, III. 82.
Moriah, Mt., III. 37, 51.
Morin, III. 51.
Mormons, I. 44, 74, 118, 537, 601, 639, 645, 653, II. 51, 298, 425, 573, 626, III. 11, 29, 38, 77-8, 142, 208, 236, 260, 270.
Morning of the Day, II. 87, 316, 414, etc.
" and the Jews, II. 417.
" star, II. 316, 317, 414, 418.
Mosaic economy, I. 214.
Moses, body of, II. 562.
" books of, III. 489, 498.
" prophet like unto, III. 28, 426.
Motives, II. 344.
Mountain, usage, III. 57, 394.
Muggletonians, I. 54, III. 70.
Multitude of the saved, II. 536, 551. See Perpetuity of the race, etc.
Münster Faction, III. 178.
Munzer, III. 70.
Mustard seed, parable of, II. 22.
Mysteries, III. 434.
" of the Kingdom, I. 141.
Mystery, meaning, I. 141.
" remaining, I. 142, 144, 172, II. 16, 182.
" extent of, I. 142.
" necessity of, I. 145.
" how to be studied, I. 146.
" general, I. 146.
" pertaining to the call, I. 410.
" of iniquity, I. 463.
" finished, II. 182, 190, III. 185.
Mysticism, I. 118, 203.
Mystics, III. 29.

Name of God, I. 300.
Napoleonic dynasty, II. 644, etc.
Nations, against the Christ, II. 104, 181, 207, 374. See War.
" all, future, II. 374.
" Canaan, of, II. 597.
" future overthrow, II. 109, 497, etc. See Posture of, Unbelief, War, Battle, Antichrist, Persecution, Sinai Mt., Gentile domination, etc.
" history of, II. 776-7.
" none with the Christ (Isa. 63), II. 743.
" none Christian, II. 778, III. 15, 193.
" posture of, III. 149, 153, 162, 186, 591, 598. See Antichrist, Unbelief, War, etc.
" spared, II. 468, 482, 491, 521, 528,

535, etc., 547, 768. See Perpetuation of the race, Jewish restoration and supremacy, Reign, etc.
Nations, usage of, II. 375, 379.
" when saved, III. 185–6, 202, 213, 458, 592, 596–7, 600. See Pre-Mill. Advent, etc.
Naturalism, I. 83, II. 156–7, III. 115, 121, 161, 207, 281, 293–4, 506, 509.
Natural Religion, III. 205, 509.
" signs, III. 128, 164.
Nature, I. 80.
" confidence in, III. 114, 115, 205. See Unbelief.
" imperfection of, I. 83, II. 152, etc. See Evil, Supernatural necessary, Miracles, Creation, etc.
" lauded, I. 107.
" repaired, I. 81. See Creation, Earth, Evil, etc.
" sympathetic, II. 498, III. 128, 151, 162, 164, 395–6.
Nearness of the Advent, I. 470, III. 133. See Second Advent, Signs.
" of the Kingdom, III. 92, etc., 95, etc., 105, etc. See Kingdom, Signs.
Nero-myth theory, II. 675.
Net, parable of the, II. 24.
New, usage of, I. 323, II. 499, 514.
" England Chiliasm, I. 541.
" Heavens and New Earth, I. 686, II. 148, 178, 499, etc. 542, etc. III. 587. See Earth, redeemed, etc.
" " " " " and early Church, II. 504, 525–6.
" " " " " perpetuity of, II. 503. See Kingdom, Race, Reign, etc.
New Jerusalem, II. 144, 527–9, etc.
" " marriage of, II. 527, etc. See Marriage.
New Test. begins with the Kingdom, how, I. 181.
" " cup of the, I. 327.
" " theology of, III. 132.
New York, III. 157.
New York Prison Assoc., III. 144.
" " State Charity Assoc., III. 144.
Nicene Creed, I. 530.
Night, II. 316, 368, 414.
Nihilism, I. 108, II. 724, III. 154.
No-age people, III. 269.
Noah and Lot, days of, III. 112, 122–4, 133, 185, 297.
Nobility of the saints. See Kings.
Novelty, Millenarianism no, I. 19.
Number of the name, II. 706.
Numbers, sacred, II. 452.

Oath of God, III. 311, 411.
" sacredness of the, I. 300, 387, 416, 422, 657, II. 202.
Objection answered, II. 521, 552.
Objections answered, Jewish, III. 408, etc. See Jewish.
Obscurity of prophecy, I. 173, II. 287.
Observation, meaning of, II. 41, 44, 46.
Offices of the saints. See Kings, Priests, Destiny, Olam.
Old and New Test., connection of, I. 157, 288, 338, 418, II. 51, 111, III. 111, 131, 242, 471.
" " " " relation to the Kingdom, I. 161.
" Test., knowledge of requisite, I. 188, II. 51, 111.
" " lowering of, I. 158. See Unbelief.
" " unbelieving attack upon, I. 159. See Genesis, Moses, books of, Miracle, Joshua's, etc.
Omnipotence of God, I. 84, II. 522. See Power.
One body, I. 615.
" Hope, the, III. 309, etc.
" faith people, I. 537, III. 269.
" hundred and forty-four thousand, II. 322, 331, 380, III. 126, 160, 163, 263, 266, 375.
" thousand years, II. 409, 456, 504, 528, 631, 638.
Oneness of Father and Son, II. 139. See Christ divine-human, Representative of God. etc.
" future, III. 71.
" of kingdom, I. 245, II. 632, III. 60, 222, 463–4.
Opinions varied and antagonistic. See Second Advent, Kingdom, Millennium, Interpretation, etc.
Opponents, writers, I. 548.
Opposition, III. 233. See History of Chiliasm.
Optimistic, theory, II. 469, III. 148.
Order, divine. See Divine Purpose.
Origen, estimate of, I. 58, 507.
" influence of, I. 499, etc. See Origen, Interpretation, spiritualistic.
Origenistic, interpretation, I. 51, 305, 310, 499, 503, 575, 593, 611, 644, II. 17, 351, 572, III. 173, 244. See Interpretation. Augustinian and spiritualistic.

Ottoman, power, III. 126, 148.
Overthrow of Jerusalem and the Sec. Advent, II. 34.

Pantheism, III. 207.
Palestine and Antichrist, II. 760–1.
" central, III. 33.
" colonization schemes, II. 88, 468.
" Exploration Soc., III. 148.
" future, III. 33. See Jewish restoration, etc.
" Jewish interest in, III. 126, 148.
" inherited, II. 199, etc., 435, 440, 446, 516. See Christ, inheritance of, Inheritance of the Patriarchs, Covenants, Abrahamic and Davidic.
" no type, III. 61.
Papacy, the, III. 77, 120, 142, 160, 162, 174, 236, 311, 546.
" and Antichrist, the, II. 221, 678, 683–4, 686–7, 689, 691, 703, 715–717, 741–2, 755–6.
" and Chiliasm, I. 513, 645, 662, 666, II. 98, 265, 383, 398, 401, 573, 598, 652.
Parable, king and servants, II. 24.
" laborers in the vineyard, of the, II. 24, 389.
" leaven, of the, I. 114, II. 22, III. 190–1.
" marriage of the king's son, of the, III. 307.
" mustard seed, of the, II. 22.
" net, of the, II. 24.
" nobleman, of the, II. 203.
" pounds, of the, II. 25, 388.
" rich man and Lazarus, of the II. 399.
" royal wedding, of the, II. 24.
" sower, of the, III. 186.
" supper, of the, III. 142.
" talents, of the, II. 24, 388.
" tares and wheat, of the, II. 21, 26, 171, 181, 272, 381.
" ten virgins, II. 24, 322, III. 299, etc.
Parables, formula of, II. 16, etc.
" and kingdom, II. 20, 223.
" perverted, I. 200, 657, 663, II. 20, 223.
" prophetical, II. 18.
Paradise, II. 399, 401, 492, III. 51.
" earthly restored, II. 434, etc., 436–7, 443–5, 480, etc., 484, etc. See Earth, Inheritance, Kingdom, Curse, Reign, Creation, etc.
Parochial Schools, III. 158.
Parousia, II. 211, 219, 221–2, III. 302.
Particularism, III. 590
Pascal, Lamb a type, the, III. 481.
Passover, II. 225, III. 26.
Patriarchs, promises to, I. 294, 309, 320, 387. See Covenant Abrahamic.
" inheritance of, I. 294, 298, 309, 413, 585, II. 52, 96, 263, 444, 516, 530, 534.
Patriotism, III. 13, 14.
Paulikians, II. 265, 676.
Paul's preaching, III. 574–5. See Preaching.
Peace, attained when, II. 770, III. 596.
" Congresses, II. 113, 770.
" Societies, III. 129, 152.
" and safety, III. 114, 117, 119, 129, 136, 140, 152, 197–8, 203, 258, 329.
" and safety prophets, II. 732–3. See Prophet the false, Whitbyan theory, Unbelief, etc.
Pentecost, day of, III. 66.
" feast of, II. 62.
Perfect Redemption, III. 325. See Redemption.
" when, II. 396.
Perfectibility, III. 436.
Perfection of God, I. 84, 86, 387, II. 88, 137, 225.
Perfectionists, I. 444, 473, 669, II. 623, III. 34, 69.
Perpetuation of the race, II. 535, etc. See Transfiguration, Jewish supremacy, Nations spared, Peter's fire, Earth, Reign, etc.
" of New Heavens and New Earth.
Perpetuity of the Covenant, I. 322, etc., 329.
" of the earth II. 427, etc., 513, etc., III. 587. See Perpetuation of the race, Kingdom, Reign.
" of the kingdom, I. 233, 565, II. 599, 630, etc.
" of the kingship, II. 603.
" of the Priesthood of Jesus, II. 601, etc., III. 456.
" of the Priesthood of the Saints, II. 617, III. 464.
Perilous times, III. 124–5, 209, 294.
Periodicals, Chiliastic, I. 553.
Persecution, future, II. 328, 334–5, 377, 700, 720, 731, etc., 734, etc., 738, etc., 745, etc., 749, etc., 751, 757–8, III. 14, 143–4, 153–6, 161–5, 172, 185, 188, 197–8, 210, 293, 298. See Antichrist.
" future, Jewish belief in, II. 734.
Person of Jesus, I. 561, etc. See Christ, interest in His person, Christological question, the great, Christ, the divine-human, etc.

Personal abuse, **III.** 231–2, 325.
" experience, **III.** 280, 285, 327–8, 475, 513.
" Second Advent, **I.** 569, 570, 674, **II.** 76, 86, 139, 156, 164, 180, 189, 208, 217, 347–8, 365, 410, 412. **III.** 59, 305, 377, 384–5, 528. See Son of Man, Parousia, Epiphaneia, Reign, Inheritance, etc.
" " " opinions respecting, **II.** 164, etc., 168, etc., 343. See Death, Millennium, Advent second perverted, Spiritualized, Unbelief of, etc.
" " " Pre-Millennial, **I.** 470, 565, 572, 577, **II.** 117, 152, 161, etc., 167, 174, etc., 194, 199, 208, 227, 342, 352, 362, 409, 414, 439, 461, 479, 499, 554, 570, 622, 668, **III.** 345, 586. See, Reign, Judgeship, Marriage, Mt. Sinai, Davidic Throne, Kingdom, Inheritance, Son of Man, etc.
Perversions, **II.** 433, 436, 444, 446, 537, 539, 541. **III.** 38, 51, 53, 152, 163, 172, 177–8, 180, 182, 187, 193, 204, 211, 219, etc., 230–1, 330, 383, 423, 451, 455, 461, 575, 577, 580, 583, 592, 594. See Extravagances, Unbelief.
Pessimist theory. **II.** 469.
Peter, Epistle of, **III.** 365.
" Second Epistle, **II.** 559.
" Confession of, **I.** 441, **III.** 515.
Petrobrusians, **I.** 661.
Petro-Joannites, **I.** 54.
Philadelphian Soc., **I.** 74.
Philippians, Epistle of, **III.** 362.
Philo's system of interpretation, **I.** 50.
Philosophy, **I.** 132, 502, **III.** 206, 208, 257, 561.
" true, **III.** 472.
Pietism and Chiliasm, **I.** 538, 540.
Piety assumed, **II.** 343.
" personal, **III.** 322–3, 513.
" perverted, **III.** 226, 254.
Pilate's judgment, **III.** 571.
Pillars, **II.** 580.
Pit, usage, **II.** 256.
Pit and snare, **III.** 294.
Place of the Kingdom (location). See Earth, Kingdom on earth, Inheritance, Patriarchs, etc.
" preparation, of the, **III.** 58.
Plagues, **III.** 162.
Plan, the divine. See Divine Purpose.
Plymouth Brethren, **I.** 405, 536, 554, 585, 640, **II.** 324, **III.** 271.
Poets, Chiliastic, **I.** 554.
Poiset, **I.** 74.
Poland, **III.** 15.
Political—divine government, **I.** 207, 240, 266, 348, 651, **II.** 97–8, 117, 119, 651, 663. See Davidic throne and Kingdom, Covenant, Reign, Church and State, Inheritance, etc.
" signs, **III.** 127, 134, 153.
Poor encouraged, **II.** 388.
Popes, **II.** 675, 691. See Papacy.
Population of Palestine, an objection, **II.** 52.
Pordage, **I.** 74.
Postponement of the Kingdom, **I.** 379, etc., 412, etc., 419, etc., 421, 433, 577, 586, 590, etc., **II.** 48, etc., 55, etc., 75, etc., 161, etc., 199, 224, etc., 639, etc., 668, **III.** 13, 242-3, 356, 454, 484–6, 503, 517, 519, 523, 527–9, 544, 546, 585. See Church preparatory, Inheritance, Kingdom, Reign, etc.
Power of God, **III.** 45, 47, 221, 239. See ability of.
Practical application of truth, **I.** 54, 56, 66, 116, 118, 477, **II.** 195, 333, 386.
" effect of Chiliasm, **I.** 551–2, 696, **II.** 167, 305, 333, 344, 390, **III.** 103, 110, 141, 163, 167–8, 199, 200, 228, 232, 235–7, 313, etc., 315, 318, 320, etc., 323, etc., 329, etc., 385, etc., 555. See Advocates, Evangelists, Missionaries, History of Chiliasm, etc.
Prayer, **I.** 117.
" answers to, **III.** 131, 390, 474.
" for the Advent, **I.** 491, 691–2, 695–6, **II.** 305, 333, **III.** 309, 315, etc., 330, 384–5. See Advent precious, Hope the blessed, etc.
" Lord's, the, **I.** 531, 618, 643, 689, 695, etc., **II.** 436, **III.** 186, 391.
" " " misapplied 694–6, **II.** 37.
Preaching, apostles, of the, **I.** 433, 436, 438, 443, 445, 469, 471, 475, 478, **II.** 17, 19. See Paul's preaching, His. of Chiliasm.
" Christ, the, **III.** 579.
" disciples, of the, **I.** 274, 362, 366, 430, **III.** 585.
" early, **III.** 245, 296, 579.
" first confined to the Jewish nation, **I.** 356.
" future, **II.** 745, 759, **III.** 160, 166.

Preaching, Jesus, of, I. 266, 362, 366, 379, 384, 446.
" John, of, I. 253, 256, 260, III. 585. See John the Baptist.
Predictions of Balaam, III. 401, etc.
" " the Christ, III. 414.
" " Daniel, I. 672, III. 405.
" " Isaiah, I. 684, III. 405.
" " Micah, I. 685.
" " Zechariah, I. 685.
Pregizerians, I. 554.
Prejudice, II. 537, 718-9, III. 552.
Pre-Millennial Advent. See Personal, Sec. Advent, Pre-Mill.
Preparatory, Church is. See Church.
Preparation for Christianity, I. 377.
Press, activity of the, III. 127, 135, 149, 150, 250, 255.
Preterite interpretation, III. 371.
Prey, usage, II. 256.
Pride, II. 594, III. 279.
Priest, Christ the, II. 145, 601, etc.
" " " design of, II. 604-5.
" " " how limited, II. 601, etc.,
" " " relates to humanity, II. 605.
" " " royal, II. 602, 604.
" " " unchangeable, II. 601, etc.,
Priests, saints, II. 607, etc., III. 71, 464.
" " activity of. II. 614.
" " bless, II. 613.
" declare the laws, II. 610.
" divinely called, II. 612.
" exaltation of, II. 608-9, 613.
" glorified, II. 616.
" glorify, the Christ, II. 611.
" gradations of rank among, II. 610. See Kings.
" holy, II. 612, 617.
" intercourse of the, II. 617.
" judges also, II. 610.
" number of the, II. 616.
" oneness of the, II. 615.
" perpetually such, II. 617.
" place of the, II. 617.
" sacrifices of the, II. 611.
" singing of the, II. 616.
" splendor of the, II. 607, 616.
" supernatural powers of the, II. 613, etc., III. 64, etc., 80, etc.
" teachers, II. 614.
" universal, II. 607.
Princes of the Captivity, II. 203.
Princes, saints are, II. 579. See Kings.
Prison, usage of, II. 254, 256.
Private judgment, I. 132.
Profession, mere, III. 498.
Proli, III. 51.
Prominence of Scripture, III. 130.
Prophecy, appreciated when, II. 745, 770, 775.
" based on the covenants, I. 337, 340.
Prophecy, comparison of, I. 171, 246, II. 141, 279.
" conditional, III. 85.
" conditioned and unconditioned, I. 176, II. 48.
" definitions of, I. 164, 169, II. 175.
" displays wisdom, I. 232.
" future, II. 147.
" fulfilment of, I. 69, 166, 309, 693, II. 175, III. 224, 252, 360, 414, 419, 421, 429, 453, 489, 492, 526.
" history, and, I. 172.
" how dealt with, III. 197-8, 200, 214, 221, 252-3. See Interpretation spiritual, Perversons, Unbelief, Millennium, etc.
" important, I. 170, II. 722.
" intention of, I. 163.
" lowering of, I. 64. See Unbelief.
" neglected, III. 200, 414.
" obscurity of, I. 172, II. 287.
" perverted, I. 167, 346, II. 103, 130, 141, 770. See Perversions.
" predictive, I. 165.
" profitable, I. 169.
" proof of, III. 437. See Analogy, Interpretation literal, Covenants, fulfilment of, etc.
" scorned, II. 770. See Unbelief.
" spiritualized, I. 205. See Interpretation spiritual, Origenistic interpretation, Augustine, etc.
" study of, requisite, I. 163, 168, II. 333, III. 108, 151, 197, 200, 213, 386, 429.
" Theocracy, its relation to downfall and, restoration of the, I. 240. See Theocracy, Kingdom.
" unbelief of, III. 131, 197-8, 221, 414, 419. See Unbelief, Perversions, Persecution, Antichrist, Gentiles high-minded, etc.
Prophesying falsely, III. 143, 152, 197-8, 203, 206. See Prophets, false, Peace and safety, etc.
Prophet, the false (allied with Antichrist), II. 692, 695, 702, III. 121, 162.
Prophets, false, III. 203, 258, 510, 594. See Prophesying.
Prophetical, Conferences, I. 554, III. 130, 153, 169, 204, 222, 263, 327, 332.
" knowledge increased, III. 97, 108, 170.
" order, III. 599.

Providence, I. 414, II. 596, III. 340, etc., 428, 430.
Providential coming, II. 167, etc., 221. See Advent, Second, perverted, spiritualized, etc.
Prudence, III. 166, 197–8, 328.
Psalms, imprecatory, II. 110, etc., 736, 771, III. 391.
Purchased possession, II. 479, 534.
Puritanism, I. 650.
Purpose, the divine, III. 287, 295–6. 340, 347, 371, 440, 454, 469, 475, 482, 487, 491, 493, 504, 515, 520, 593, 597, 600.

Quakers, I. 118, III. 11, 69.
Qualifications, moral, I. 415, 601, 617, II. 75, 195, 225, 332, 386, 612, III. 279, 284–5, 286–7–8, 307, 327. See Trial, Firstborn, Firstfruits, etc.
" of saints glorified. See Priests, Kings.
Queen. See Bride, Marriage of the Lamb.
Question, the great Christological, III. 512, etc., 537, etc.
Quicken, usage, II. 256, 258, 299.
Quickening spirit, II. 258.
Quotations, why freely employed, I. 20.
Quoting prophecy, the apostles, III. 185.

Race, antiquity of, III. 500.
" delivered, II. 491, III. 455, 584.
" perpetuated, II. 535, etc., III. 191, 321, 587.
" " objections to, II. 552, etc.
" unity of the, III. 500.
Rank, grades of future, II. 387. See Kings degrees of rank, Priests, gradations of, Reward proportioned.
Ransomed, II. 258.
Rashness of Gentiles, I. 329, 333, 395, 398, 416, 425, 615, II. 57, 73, 78, 91. See Gentiles high-minded, Interpretation spiritual, etc.
Rationalism, III. 207, 224, 408.
Reason, III. 280–1, 286–7–8–9.
" exaltation of, I. 135, III. 155, 220, 239, 280, 289. See Unbelief.
" and Faith, III. 286–9.
" perverting the Kingdom, III. 220, 288–9.
Redeemed, II. 258. See Saints, Firstborn, etc.
Redeemer, III. 449, etc., 453–4, 529. See Christ perfect, etc., Restorer, Redemption, Evil, etc.
" perfect, a, III. 325, 529. See Christ.
Redemption, I. 419, II. 182, 196, 258, 307, 410, 433, 535, etc.
" body of the, II. 229, 236–7, 240, 397.
Redemption, complete, II. 145, 149, 156, 200, 237, 348, 370, 466, 479, etc., 483, etc., 485, 490, 515, 534, etc., 537, 604, III. 325, 366, 369, 436, 449, etc. 454–5, 457, 493, 539, 550, 553, 600. See Restitution, Blessings forfeited. Christ, Restorer, Evil, Curse, etc.
" extent of, II. 536, etc., 550, etc.
" imperfect, made, II. 437, 537, 543.
" perverted, III. 455, 457, 562.
" plan of, III. 429, 436, 529, 584. See Divine Purpose, Covenant, End, Kingdom, etc.
" progressive, II. 469, 435, etc., 535, etc., 547.
" purchased possession, II. 479, 534.
" signs of the, I. 96. See Signs, Kingdom, nearness of, Unbelief, etc.
Reformation, the I. 524, etc., 666.
Reformed Jews, I. 376, II. 232. See Jews.
" Presbyterian Church, I. 649, II. 778.
Reformers, I. 524, II. 215, III. 159, 175–7. See Luther, Calvin, Knox, etc.
Refreshing, Jewish belief concerning, II. 461, 467.
" meaning of the, II. 462, etc., 470.
" resurrection, and, II. 464, 471.
" times of, II. 461, etc
Regeneration, II. 257, 259, 300, 473 etc. III. 587.
" extent of the, II. 475, 477.
" meaning of, II. 473–4.
" resurrection, and, II. 275, etc.
" washing of, II. 478.
Rejoicing of Jesus, III. 602.
Reign of the Christ, II. 504, 532–3, 536, 561, 768, III. 213, 370, 539, 543, 548, 550, 553, 555, 586. See Supremacy, World-dominion, Kingdom, Theocracy, Reign of the Saints, Judgeship, etc.
" " " " perpetuity of, I. 233, 565, III. 599, 630, etc.
" " " " visible, I. 117, 123, 204, 342, 348, 351, 364, 369, 564, 569, 573, 575, 641, 648, 651, 655, 660, 674–5, 683, 692, II. 33, 44, 46, 92, 97,

117, 123, 204, 340, 343, 348, 504, 513, 532–3, III. 43, etc., 460, etc., 463, 465, 528, 544–5, 548–9, 552, 582, 584, 587. See Davidic throne and Kingdom, Inheritance, Son of Man, Davidic Covenant, etc.
Reign of the Christ, objections to visible, II. 344, etc., 346, etc., 348. See also Christ, dishonoring of, etc.
" " " " and the morning, II. 417.
" " " saints, I. 388, 536, 691, II. 97, 128, 134, 139, 140, 179, 225, 304, 316, 330, 333, 376, 385, 387, 391, 432–3, 570, 577, 590. III. 30, 58, 71, 215, 238, 307, 587, 600. See Saints, future exaltation, Inheritance, Kings, Priests, Princes, Judges, etc.
" " " " blessings of the, II. 591, 593. See Blessings, Kingdom, etc.
" " " " degrees in, II. 591. See Rank, Reward, Priests, Degrees.
" " " " design of, II. 588, etc., 593, etc.
" " " " earth, on, II. 574, 598–9, 603. See Earth, Kingdom, Inheritance, etc.
" " " " grandeur of the, II. 570, etc., 574, 578–9, 581.
" " " " honor of the, II. 592–4, 599.
" " " " inaugurated, when, II. 572, etc., 590, 598. See Advent Second. Hope the Blessed, etc.
" " " " perpetuity of the, II. 603. See Kingdom, perpetuity of, Kings, Priests, etc.
" " " " perversions of the, II. 571–3, 575, 597–8.
Reign of the saints, priesthood associated with the, II. 71, 215, 464. See Priests.
" " " " qualifications, for the II. 590–1, III. 81, 457. See Firstborn, Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Supernatural, etc.
" " " " representative of Christ's reign, II. 596.
" " " " supernatural associated with the. II. 595. See Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Miracles, Supernatural, Kings, Priests, etc.
" " " " who are engaged in the II. 590. See Firstfruits, Firstborn, One hundred and forty-four thousand, Elect, Dispensation, design of saints gathered, etc.
Religion, future, man's II. 722, 725, 728–9, 760, 770–1. See Antichrist, Humanitarianism, Unbelief, etc.
" natural, III. 440.
" universal, III. 207.
Religious liberty, future, II. 742.
" unbelief. See under Unbelief.
Rellyanites, I. 537, II. 290.
Rellyism, III. 269.
Representative of God, who, II. 349, III. 537, etc.
Reproaches, III. 230.
Republicanism eulogized, II. 777–8, III. 12, 592, 594.
Responsibility of rejectors, III. 166, 197–8–9, 225, 229, 230, 239, 328, 383.
" " unbelief, II. 732, III. 294, 528. See Unbelief inexcusable, etc.
Rest, the, II. 441, 448, etc., 454, etc., 463, III. 396.
" extent of the, II. 467, 470–1.
" times of the, II. 469.
Restitution, the, I. 96, 102, II. 141, 146, 174, 178, 188, 300, 348, 408, III. 493, 587. See Creation, Restorer, Curse, Evil, Reign, Kingdom, etc.
" Jewish view of, II. 461, 467.
" miraculous, I. 100, II. 144, 152 etc., 187, 195–6. See super-

natural, necessity of, Creation, etc.
Restitution, times of. II. 425, 461, etc., 535.
Restitutionists, III. 269.
Restorer, the, I. 250, II. 76, 78, 152 etc., 186, 195, 307, 430–1, 466, 468, 472, 486, III. 454, 473, 478, 494, 515. See under Christ, Blessings forfeited, Evil removed, Restitution, etc.
Restoration of the Jews. See Jewish nation, restoration of, supremacy of, Election, etc.
Resurrection, animals of, II. 484.
" Apocalypse, and the, II. 264, etc., 285, 311.
" belief, the ancient, II. 260, 404.
" " " early, II. 228, 235, 250, 253, 256, 291, 304, 308–9.
" " " Jewish, I. 297, 302, II. 235–6, 244, 247, 249, 253, 261, 270, 272, 290, 297, 299, 300, 302, 305, 308, 311, 404, 409. See Jewish belief.
" believers and, II. 299, 385.
" birth, a, II. 477. See Birth, usage and future.
" children of the, II. 237, 298.
" comparison and, II. 302.
" concessions and, II. 241, 246, 253, 265, 267, 271, 303, 309.
" corporeal, II. 228, etc., 236, 239, 250, 304, 308.
" " denied, II. 230, 272.
" corruption and (Ps. 16: 10) II. 237.
" Daniel and, II. 245, etc.
" " of, II. 248.
" design of the, II. 304.
" Ezekiel and, II. 250, etc.
" first the, II. 174, 227, 244, 264, etc., 272, 295, 311, 439, 461, 473, 554, III. 245, 345, 586.
" general analogy and, II. 308.
" Gospels and Epistles, and the, II. 295, etc., 311.
" harvest, and the, II. 269, 272.
" ignored, II. 288.
" Isaiah, and, II. 274.
" Jewish, II. 260, 290, 297.
" Jews and the, III. 418.
" Kingdom, and the, II. 227, 243.
" land, and the, II. 251.
" life, II. 477.
Resurrection, morning, and the, II. 415, 417.
" Moses of, II. 562.
" necessary, I. 296, 298, 301, 304, II. 170, 175, 180, 189, 227, etc., 232, etc., 244, 298, 300, 304, III. 524.
" objections, and, II. 278, etc., 283, 301.
" Old Test., and the, II. 244, etc., 274, etc.
" Paul, and, II. 244, 298.
" pledge, a, III. 523.
" private, II. 314.
" prominence of, II. 228, 237.
" raised, who are, II. 285. See first.
" Rachel, and, II. 253, 255.
" refreshing, and the, II. 464, 471.
" restoration, and the, II. 305.
" rest of the dead, first and the, II. 273, etc., 278, 288, 290.
" small children of. See Rachel above.
" spiritual, II. 240, 284.
" spiritualizing, and, II. 309.
" time, of the, II. 285. See first, Sec. Advent.
" unbelief, and, III. 524–5.
Revelation, divine, III. 284–5, 287–8–9.
" future, II. 193, III. 29, etc.
" interpret, how, II. 715.
" nature, and, III. 30.
" present, sufficiency, I. 626, II. 574, III. 29, 287, 294.
" unbelief, and. See Unbelief.
Reward, full, a, II. 591.
" given, when, II. 183, 330, 376–7, 379, 388, 394, 396. See future, Sec. Advent, Inheritance, Intermediate state, Reign, etc.
" future, III. 166–7, 229, 277, 306–7, 328.
" proportioned, II. 586–7, 591. See Judgment of believers, Degrees, Rank, Kings, Priests.
Rib, usage, III. 431.
Riches, II. 143.
Rich man and Lazarus, parable of the, II. 399.
River, usage of, III. 394.
Rod of iron, II. 753, III. 189.
" and staff, III. 389.
Roman Catholic Church, I. 118, 202, 513, 645, 662, 666, II. 98, 103, 154, 215, 220, 265, 383, 398, 401. See Papacy, Popes.
" Empire, III. 132.
" " divided form, I. 672, 677, II. 115, 176, 639, etc., 693, 754.

Roman Empire, God's estimate, of the, III. 15.
" " headless, III. 126.
" " jealousy of, I. 270, 682, 497, 557, II. 683, 776.
" " kingdom, and the, I. 468, 644, 682.
" " importance of knowing the, II. 643, 685, 693, 755.
" " revival of the, II. 648, etc., 668, 693, 695.
" " traced, II. 640, etc.
Romans, Epistle to the, III. 361.
Royalty, place of manifestation, III. 32, etc., 587.
Royal wedding, parable of the, III. 24.
Russia, II. 648, 688, 695, 710.

S bbatarians, III. 266.
Sabbathai, II. 759.
Sabbath, typical, III. 99.
Sabbatical year, II. 145, 368, 452, 487, III. 90.
Sabbatism, the, I. 476, 486, 527, II. 448, etc., 454, etc., 487, III. 587.
" chronology, and, II. 459.
" contrasts, its, II. 457.
" early Church views, II. 449, etc., 456, etc., 452, 487.
" Jewish views, II. 448, etc., 450, 456.
Sacred numbers, II. 452.
Sacrifice of Isaac, III. 506.
" " Jesus, III. 455, 600. See Death.
Sacrifices, bloody, not future, II. 83, etc., 89, etc.
Saints, association with angels, II. 621.
" coming of, II. 175, 187.
" destiny of, II. 593–6, 620.
" future exaltation of, III. 28, 51, 71, 306–7, 447, 458, 578, 586, 591, 593, 600.
" gathering of, II. 177, III. 96, 600. See Elect., Call.
" glory of, II. 418. See Glorification, destiny, etc.
" honor of, II. 588, 592, 594, 620, 740, 766.
" inheriting, I. 303, 310, 322, 392, 402, 414, 584, 600, 602, II. 13, 224, 227, 263, 330, 374, 376, 439, 570, 607, III. 62, 457, 460, 585. See Inheritance, Earth, Kingdom, Reign, etc.
" Judges, II. 578, 583–4, 610, III. 81. See Judge, Kings, Judgment, etc.
" Judgment of, II. 385, etc., 389, etc.
" Kings, II. 577, etc., 590, etc., III. 30, 58, 71, 215, 238, 307, 457, 587, 600, See Kings, Inheritance, Reign, Judge, Prince, etc.
" morning, and the, II. 416, etc.
Saints, Most High, of the, II. 587.
" not to be despised, II. 593–4.
" present condition of, II. 572.
" power over angels, II. 620.
" Priests, II. 71, 215, 464, 607, etc. See Priests.
" reigning of the, I. 388, 536, 691, II. 97, 128, 134, 139, 140, 179, 225, 304, 316, 330, 333, 376, 385, 387, 391, 432–3, 570, etc., 607, etc., 630, III. 30, 58, 71, 215, 238, 307, 587, 600. See Reign, Kings, Priests, Kingdom, etc.
" riches of, II. 596.
" supernatural power of, III. 64, etc., 71, 445, 447, 458.
Salvation, II. 142, 154, 181, 386, 391, 410. See Redemption, Blessings, Curse, Evil, Reign, etc.
" future, III. 395, etc., 529, 539, 554. See Second Advent, Creation, Millennium, etc.
" great, the, II. 536, III. 451, etc. See Reign, Blessings, Kings, Priests, Race, etc.
" perfected, II. 466. See Redemption, perfected.
" perverted, III. 453. See Perversions, Spiritualizing.
" usage of term, III. 160, 149, 150, 453.
Sanctuary, II. 202, III. 38.
" cleaning of the, II. 115, 603, III. 458, etc.
Satan, III. 188, 262.
" bound, II. 142, 147, 181, 292, 359.
" bruised, II. 582.
" temptation of, I. 698, etc.
" titles of, I. 701.
" victory, obtains no, II. 433, 536.
" who, II. 621.
Saved, the multitude of, II. 536, 551.
Science and the Bible, III. 498, etc.
" future, III. 439.
" and Religion, conflict between, III. 507–9.
Scoffers, II. 335, 431.
Scoffing, III. 115, 134, 136, 153, 256.
Scottish Church, I. 649.
Scripture, analogy of, III. 343, etc.
" comparison of, I. 112, 152, 333.
" doctrine of Kingdom in it, I. 111. See Kingdom based on.
" explained, II. 108, 425, II. 388, etc.
" extent of, I. 154. See prominency of, Covenants, etc.
" how undermined, I. 118. See Interpretation spiritual, Unbelief, Perversions, etc.
" indefiniteness, I. 149.
" infallible guide, I. 116, 125, 135, 204.

Scripture needs man's agency, I. 120.
" only authoritative, I. 110, III. 272, 285, 287–8.
" prominence of, III. 130, 153, 225.
" reason, and, I. 136. See Reason, Unbelief and reason.
" sufficiency of, I. 124.
" supremacy of, I. 132.
" whole, as a, I. 158.
Sea, II. 500, 527, 529, III. 394.
Seal, the last, II. 195.
" the sixth, II. 686, 689, 717, III. 372, 374.
Sealed vision, II. 661.
Seasons, Millenial, II. 528.
Second Adventists, I. 523, 536, II. 55, 79, III. 268. See Millerism.
Sect of the Holy Ghost, III. 74.
Sela, III. 26–7.
Self-denial, III. 279, 284.
Self-righteousness, I. 417.
Senses, the various, I. 58.
" of prophecy, I. 193.
Septuagint Chronology, II. 163, 451.
Serpent, the, II. 448, etc.
Servetus, I. 54, 635.
Seven, II. 452.
" Churches, III. 377, etc.
Seventh-Day Baptists, III. 11.
" " Adventists, I. 536, II. 79, 323, 602–3, 575, 602–3, 627, III. 142, 163–4, 211, 263, etc., 339.
" " observed, II. 458.
" " question, III. 264–5, 268.
Seventy weeks, II. 659, etc., 718.
Shadow of death, III. 389.
Shakers, I. 44, 54, 74, 118, 473, 488, 552, 591, II. 166, 232, 425, 626, III. 142, 153, 236, 270.
Shaking of heaven and earth, II. 494, etc.
Sheep and goats, II. 375.
Sheol, II. 401–2.
Shepherd, usage, III. 388.
Shepherds, II. 580.
Shiloh, III. 398–9.
Shout, II. 331.
Sign of the Son of Man, II. 327, III. 162, 164.
Signs, I. 381, 580, II. 46, 498, 755, 758, III. 94, 109, etc., 132–3, 139, 160, etc., 163, etc., 199, 209, 237, 239, 509.
" cheering, III. 170.
" classification of, III. 113, 132–3, 159, 160, 165.
" knowledge, of the, III. 110.
" inspiration, and, III. 167.
" miraculous, III. 472. See Anti-Christ, Advent.
" nature of the, III. 112, etc., 132–3, 164.
" neglected, III. 165.
" political, III. 127, 134, 153.
Signs, redemption, and, III. 170.
Silence of Scripture, I. 104.
Simonians, III. 29.
Sinai Mt., II. 326, 759, 762–3, 766, III. 17, etc., 588.
" " and investiture, III. 25.
" " and revelation, III. 30.
" " route from, III. 22, 27, 393.
Sinaitic Covenant, I. 311.
Sin, I. 102. See Blessings forfeited, Curse, Evil.
" blotting out of, III. 459.
" mystery, a, I. 103.
" overruled, I. 105. See Redemption, Salvation.
provision for, III. 420, 425, 431. See Christ.
" removed, III. 455. See New Heavens, etc.
" removing. See under Christ.
" subject to no. See Christ, Saints, Kings, Priests.
Singing, future, II. 616.
Six days of Creation, II. 458, 469.
Sleep, usage, II. 256, 258, III. 431.
Slumbering and sleeping, III. 304.
Smith, Joseph, I. 204. See Mormons.
Snare, III. 97, 102, 112. See Pit and snare.
Socialism, II. 623, 724, 779.
Society of Friends, I. 118.
" " Korn, I. 537.
Socinians, I. 159.
Sodom, usage, II. 290.
Solomonic age, II. 524.
Son of Man, the, I. 559, 565, etc., 582, 614, II. 167, 180, 223, 327, 341, 346–7, 351–2, 355, 374, 410, 563, III. 553–4.
" " " kingdom given to the, I. 577, 581, II. 223.
" " " meaning of, I. 566, II. 167.
" " " sign of the. See Sign.
Sons of God, II. 581.
" " " manifestation of the, II. 592.
Southcott, Joanna, I. 118, II. 139, 323.
Soul, usage, II. 266, 270, 281, 293, III. 389.
Sovereignty, divine, I. 250, 556, 559, III. 559, 563, 583.
Spared nations, II. 468, 482, 491, 521, 528, 535, etc., 547, 768. See Race, perpetuation of, Restoration of Jewish nation, Reign, etc.
Spear, II. 706.
Spirit, aid how given, I. 52, 66, 117, 119, 332.
" earnest of the, III. 67.
" claimed, how, I. 118, 120, 172, 204.
" filled with the, III. 70. See Baptism.
" future outpouring of, II. 147, III. 64, etc.
" and the Jewish nation, III. 75.

Spiritual blessings, I. 307, 310, 315, 331, 365, 384, 400, 511, 575, 687, II. 44, 84, 90, 93, 97, 127, 141, 144, 151, 178, 600, III. 167–8, 457, 460, etc., 463, etc., 590–1. See Kings, Priests, Reign, Kingdom, Redemption perfected, etc.
" body, II. 232, 234, 238, 241, 350, III. 464.
" discernment, I. 52, 172, 332.
" kingdom, II. 92, 99, 121, 204.
Spiritualistic interpretation. See Interpretation spiritualistic, Origenistic, Allegorical, etc.
Spirituality of the Kingdom, II. 44, 604, 607, etc., 611, 615, III. 460, etc., 462, etc. See Spiritual blessings, Kings, Priests, etc., etc.
Spiritualism, III. 123–4, 145–6, 155–6, 290, 436.
Spiritualists, I. 75, 118, 134, 157, 684, II. 197, 232, 425, 563, 706, 720, III. 29, 163, 165.
Spiritualizing, III. 64, 88, 219, 310, 462–3, 525. See Interpretation spiritualistic, etc.
Spirituals, II. 677.
Star, usage, II. 580, III. 403–4.
" morning, the, II. 316, 317, 414, III. 404.
Stars, lost, II. 429.
Starovers, II. 674.
State and Church, I. 207, 240, 266, 348, 651, 663, II. 97–8, 117, 119, III. 14, 16, 83, 338, 462, 545, 551, 582, 591, 595–6.
" Churches, I. 395, 653.
St. Louis, III. 201.
Stone, I. 676, 683.
Storch, III. 70.
Storrites, III. 269.
Study of Scripture neglected, I. 46, 66. See Scripture, Prophecy, Covenant.
Steubner, III. 70.
Subjects related, III. 324, etc.
Subordination of the Son, I. 579. See Christ.
Sudden Coming, III. 23. See Advent second.
Sun, the, II. 317, 414.
" " darkened, III. 151, 164.
Sunday, III. 265, 268.
" fasting on, II. 458.
Supernatural, the, I. 80, 97, 365, 676, II. 33, 80, 84, 89, 105, 345, 595, 613, 758, 767, 772, III. 28, 64, etc., 67, etc., 70, etc., 456, 463, 473. See necessity of the, Miracles, Christ, Kings, Saints, Reign, Creation, Kingdom, Baptism, etc.
Supernatural, necessity of the, I. 81, II. 53, 80, 89, 99, 105, 144, 147, 152, etc., 156, 472, 492, 498, III. 71, 73, 184, 220, 238–9, 287–8–9, 295–6, 341, 347, 440, 464, 472, 477, 479, 488, 503, 506, 514, 521.
" and the natural, III. 511.
Supremacy, Jewish, II. 92, etc., 114.
Survival of Chiliasm, I. 553.
Swedenborgianism, I. 74, 204, 248, 444, 473, 488, II. 41, 55, 165, 232, 351, 366, 381, 425, 626, III. 29, 39, 51, 236, 256, 573. See Interpretation.
Symbolic (Rev. ch. 19), II. 345.
" language, II. 686.
Symbols, how treated, III. 375.
Synonymous, Church and Kingdom, not, I. 632.
Switzerland, III. 140.

Tabernacle of God, III. 591.
" typical, II. 568.
Tabernacles, feast of, III. 90.
Talents, parable of the, II. 24, 388.
Talmudical system, III. 415.
Tares and wheat, parable of the, II. 21, 26, 171, 181, 272, 381, III. 118, 120.
Teleological, importance of, I. 78. See Divine Purpose.
Temperance movement, the, III. 143.
Temple, the, III. 90.
" of God, II. 707.
" typical, II. 568.
Temporal, I. 305, 310, II. 120.
" blessings, II. 436, 442, 660, III. 457, 462. See Reign, Creation, Jewish nation, Race, etc.
" deliverer, I. 273, 384, II. 776, etc., III. 425–6, 457, 542.
Temptation of Jesus, I. 698, etc.
Ten horns, I. 672, II. 693, 696, 707, 718, 752, 754–5, III. 149.
Ten Kingdoms. See Ten Horns.
Ten tribes, II. 65, etc.
Testaments, Old and New, I. 157, 288, 338, 418, II. 51, 111, III. 111, 131, 242, 471.
Testimony, human, I. 98.
Thamer, I. 54.
Theism, I. 86.
Theocracy. See under the head of Kingdom for all the particulars not given here, the two being synonymous.
" meaning of, I. 216, II. 123–4, III. 352, 462, 520, 540, 545, 582–3, 592–3.
" blessings, greatness, glory, etc. of. See Kingdom.
" fundamentals, covenants, etc., pertaining to. See Kingdom covenants.

Theocracy, establishment of. See Kingdom Restoration, Second Advent, Restitution, etc.
Theocratic house, III. 57. See Davidic Kingdom.
" rule, III. 88, 435, 453, 460, 462, 495, 531, 582, 589, 590, etc. See Kingdom, Reign, World-dominion, Supremacy, etc.
" idea, extent of, III. 443, etc., 447, 477, 479, 487–8, 495, 515, 531, 537, 555, 558, 582, etc., 590, etc., 592, etc., 595.
" idea, figuratively given, III. 43, 45.
" and the Jewish nation, III. 433, 473, 572. See Davidic throne and Kingdom, Jewish nation, restoration of, etc.
" idea perverted, III. 15, 16, 88, 352, 383, 512, 520, 551, 575. See Kingdom.
Theodicy, III. 434. See Sin, Evil, Divine Purpose.
Theology, comparative, III. 504–5.
Thessalonians, Epistles to the, III. 363.
Thief-like Coming, II. 176, 322, 334. See Advent, stages of, interval, Mt. Sinai.
Thousand years, the, II. 409, 456, 504, 528, 631, 638.
" " Jewish view of, II. 409.
" " one hundred and forty-four, II. 322, 331, 380, III. 126, 160, 163, 263, 266, 375.
Three unclean spirits, the, III. 162, 373.
Throne, Davidic. See Davidic.
" the Father's and Son's, II. 355, 357.
Thunder storm, III. 406.
Time, Christ's death, of, III. 480–1.
" Christ's knowledge of, III. 93.
" end of, II. 424.
" exact unknown, III. 93, etc., 99, etc., 104, 168.
" future, II. 411, III. 92.
" how regarded by God, I. 443, 475, etc , 668. See also Time, Spirit's estimate of.
" how reserved, I. 580.
" last, the, II. 423.
" mistakes in, III. 92, etc., 99, etc., 104, 256–7.
" of the end, II. 336, 653, 658, III. 97.
" Spirit's estimate of, III. 486. See Time, how regarded by God.
" shortened, II. 460.
" times and a half, III. 99.
Times, Gentiles, of the, I. 243, 406, 419, II. 60, 70, 87, 115, 459, 472, 624, 639, 774, III. 12, 104, 185, 336, 505.
" Messiah of the, III. 570.
" seven, III. 99.
Times, refreshing, of, II. 461, etc.
" " " Jewish view, II. 461, etc.
" " " meaning, II. 462, etc.
" Rest of, II. 469.
" restitution, of, II. 425, 461, etc., III. 587.
" " " Jewish view, II. 461, etc.
" " " meaning, II. 465.
" " " the times, II. 469.
Timothy, Epistles to, III. 363.
Titus, Epistle to, III. 363.
Toleration, broad, III. 121–2, 143–4.
Tradition, I. 130, 498, 513, 515, III. 346.
" analogy of, III. 343, etc., 345.
Training school, a, III. 445.
Transfiguration, II. 194, 554, etc.
" no dream, II. 558, etc.
Translation of saints, II. 314, etc., 319, etc., III. 588.
" " " effect, II. 327, III. 166, 304.
" " " known, II. 326.
" " " influence of, II. 334. See effect.
" " " invisible, II. 317.
" " " scorned, II. 335.
" " several, II. 329,
" " " value of, II. 333.
" " " why a, II. 332.
Transposition of subjects, II. 525.
Trees of righteousness, II. 580.
Trials necessary, II. 590, 592, 612. See Kings, Priests, Reward, Degrees, etc,
Tribulation, future, III. 118, 154–5–6, 160–1, 164–5, 198, 200, 293–4, 598. See Antichrist.
" Jewish, II. 60, 181, 190, 663, III. 113, 126.
Triumphal entry, II. 759.
Trouble, unparalleled, future, II. 655, 731, etc., 734, etc., 737, etc., 741, etc., 751, etc., 761, etc., 767–8. See Tribulation future, Antichrist, War, etc.
Trump, II. 331.
Trumpet, the seventh, II. 183, 190, 264, 295, 359.
Trumpets, feast of, II. 452.
Truth, adaptedness of, III. 280.
" divine, I. 155.
" triumphant, III. 209, 258.
Turkish Empire, III. 126.
Turneyites, I. 571.
Twelve hundred and sixty days, the, II. 755–6.
" tribes, the, I. 405.
Twenty-three hundred and sixty days, III. 99.
Types, Gospel, I. 630.
Typical, ark, the, II. 487.
" Canaan not, III. 61.

Typical, Covenants not, I. 291, 295.
" Davidic throne not, II. 199, etc., 347, etc.
" Eden not, II. 61.
" how applied, I. 305, 343, 347, II. 51–2, 78, 83, 99, 170, 204, etc. III. 61.
" inheritance not, II. 204.
" Jewish nation not, I. 406.
" Jordan of what, II. 393.
" Kingdom not, II. 524.
" Mt. Zion not, III. 32, 37, 51.
" Sabbath, III. 99.
" Tabernacle, II. 568.
" Temple, II. 568.

Ultra-literalism, I. 63.
Ultramontanism, II. 143.
Unbelief, Advents, and the, I. 244, 372, 443, 459, 473, 477, II. 116, 155, 162, 191, III. 134, 142, 185, 195, 198–9, 204–5, 242, 258, 295, 486, 520, 527, etc., 581. See Advents.
" Antichrist, and the, III. 679, 700, 722, 725, 732, 759. See Antichrist, War, etc.
" Apocalypse, and the, III. 367, etc.
" attacks of, I. 61, 589, II. 443, 723, 726, 780. See bitterness of, widespread, destructive, etc.
" bigotry, and, III. 497.
" bitterness of, III. 130, 154–5, 199, 205, 214, 225, 234, 236–7, 238, 242–3, 280, 294, 496, 499, 500, 508–9, 516, 521.
" Chiliasm, and, I. 450, 454, 460, II. 150, 186, 552, 571. See History of, Heresy, etc.
" Church, and the, I. 593, 645, 653, 661, III. 116, 118, 155, 199, 203–5, 207–8, 210, 217, etc., 222, 225, 230, 234–6–7–8–9, 242, 248, etc., 250, etc., 255, etc., 297, 311, 318, 329, 383, 425, 587. See Kingdom and Church, Church, Dispensation, design of, Election, Wall of partition, etc.
" concessions to, I. 61.
" conscience and, III. 285–6.
" covenants, and the, I. 286, 316, 334, 400, II. 138. See Covenants.
" credulity, and III. 291–3, 495–7.
" David, and I. 235, 268, 348, 724.
" destructive, I. 82, II. 288, 418, 446, 720, 770, 780. See bitterness of, widespread, Antichrist, Persecution future, War, Trouble, Tribulation, Signs, etc.
Unbelief, development theory, and the, I. 115, 204, 434. 438, 460, 510, II. 720, 726, 736, 746, 760. See Humanitarianism, Naturalism, etc.
" diversity of, III. 280, 288–9, 441, 519, etc. See forms of, Perversions, etc.
" faith, and, I. 138, 307, II. 150, 552, 727, 758, 760, III. 283–4, 286–8, 291–2, 495, 497, 511. See credulity of, reason, etc.
" forms of, III. 280–1, 288–9, 290, 430, 491. See diversity of, Perversions, etc.
" future, and the, II. 431, 701, 703, 722, 732, 778–9, III. 436, 441, 512, 577, 595. See widespread, Antichrist, Persecution, etc.
" heathendom, and, III. 505.
" history, and, II. 776.
" hope, and its future, II. 429. See future.
" humanity of Jesus, and the II. 700.
" humility, and, III. 497.
" Incarnation, and the, I. 571, III. 526.
" Inexcusable, III. 238, 241, 256, 280, 283–4, 285, 288, 290, 292–3, 328–9, 440, 470–1, 476, 479, 483, 486, 489, 490, 494, 499, 527, etc., 533.
" Jewish, and, I. 424, 427, 446, II. 493, 507. See Jewish for extension.
" Jewish nation, of the, III. 126. See Jewish nation.
" Judging, and, II. 360.
" Kingdom, and the, I. 190, 198, 424, 429, 459, 510, 622, 629, II. 200, 340, III. 484–5–6, 487–8, 502, 520, 528, 546, 572, 575. See Kingdom, Reign, Covenants, etc.
" Kingship of the saints, and the, II. 593, 597.
" Messiah, and the, III. 155, 295–6, 474, 512, 513, 516, 520, 533, 537, etc., 539, 567–8, 573–8, 580–1. See Incarnation, etc.
" miracles, and, II. 758, III. 78, 220, etc, 239, 281, 288–9, 295–6, 472, 521, 533. See Supernatural, Resurrection, etc.
" natural religion, and, II. 505. See Naturalism, Humanitarianism.
" New Jerusalem, and the, III. 48.
" prophecy, and, I. 164, 169, 233, 278, II. 89, 99, 149, 154, 722,

728, 760, **III.** 131, 237–8, 240, 242, 255–6, 288, 489.
Unbelief, reason, and, **III.** 288–9, 291–2, 430, 436, 441, 490, 520, 511.
" redemption, and, **II.** 703.
" reigning, **II.** 571, 770.
" responsibility of, **III.** 529. See inexcusable.
" resurrection, and, the, **I.** 301, **II.** 262, 312, **III.** 524–5.
" revelation, and, **II.** 574.
" salvation, and, **III.** 279, etc., 288, etc., 436, 441, 469, 470, 476, 562.
" saying of Jesus, and the, **I.** 630.
" science, and, **III.** 468–9, 470–1, 492, etc., 496, 498–9, 507–511.
" signs and, **III.** 136, 165.
" supernatural, and the, **III.** 133, 202, 220, etc., 239, 278, 281, 288–9, 291–3, 295–6, 472–4, 476, 479, 483, 496, 506, 510. See miracles.
" suppression, and, **II.** 288.
" Theocracy, and the **I.** 238, 316, 411, 428. See Kingdom, Unbelief and the Kingdom.
" translation, and the, **II.** 335.
" widespread, **I.** 84, **II.** 106, 162, 475, 683, 720, etc., 723, etc., 779, etc., **III.** 115, etc., 118, 121–2, 130, 133–4–5–6–7–8–9, 140–3–4–6, 154–8, 201, 205–6, 208, 218, etc., 239, 248, etc., 251–3, 258, 278, etc., 292–4, 297, 437, 440, 507, 508–9, 577.
" worship, and, **II.** 727.
Unchangeable. See Christ, Covenants, Oath, Faithfulness, Priesthood, Kings, etc.
Unclean spirits, the three, **III.** 162, 373.
United States, the, **II.** 743, 778–9. **III.** 15.
Union of Church and State. See under Church and State.
" " believers, **III.** 122, 144.
" " " future, **II.** 745.
" " saints with God, **II.** 588, 615.
" " Old and New Tests. **I.** 157, 288, 338, 418, **II.** 51, 111, **III.** 111, 131, 242, 471.
Unitarianism, **III.** 534.
Unity, **I.** 594, **II.** 295.
" attained, how, **III.** 337, 595.
" Church of the, **I.** 637.
" Epistles, of the, **III.** 361, etc.
" Gospels, of the, **III.** 350, etc.
" manifested, **III.** 335, etc., 588.
" race, of the, **II.** 774, **III.** 500.
" saints of, **I.** 675.
Universalists, **II.** 366, 621, **III.** 262.
Universe, the, **III.** 439, 446.
Urim and Thummim, **I.** 219, **II.** 758.

Vanity of worldly expectations, **II.** 225.
Vaticanism, **II.** 154. See Papacy.
Vaudois, **I.** 521.
Veil Jewish, the, **II.** 661.
Vengeance, **II.** 742, etc., 766, 768, 771–2, 775, **III.** 22, 80, 129, 184–5, 189, 391, 404, 437. See War, Antichrist, Imprecatory Psalms, etc.
Verbal inspiration. See under Inspiration
Vials, **II.** 686, 689, 717, 760, 764, **III.** 372–3.
Vindictiveness, alleged, **II.** 736, 771.
Vintage, **III.** 382.
Violence used, **I.** 674, 680, 686, **II.** 102, etc., 105, 109, 701, 740, etc., 776.
Virgins, parable of the ten, **II.** 24, 322.
Visibility of the Kingdom, **I.** 351, 364, 369, 564, 569, 573, 575, 641, 648, 651, 655, 660, 674–5, 683, 692, **II.** 33, 44, 46, 92, 97, 117, 123, 204, 340, 343, 348, 504, 513, 532–3, **III.** 43, etc., 460, etc., 463, 465, 528, 544–5, 548–9, 552, 582, 584, 587. See Covenants, Inheritance, Kingdom, Reign, Kings, etc.
Visible glory, **II.** 146, 176, 178, 188–9, 220, 345, 348, 351, 395. See Kings, Priests.
" reign, **II.** 340, etc. See Reign, Kingdom.
" " objections, **II.** 344, etc., 346, etc., 348.
Vision sealed, **II.** 661,
Voice, **II.** 331.
" of the Lord, **III.** 406.
Von Buttler (Eva), **III.** 51.

Waiting, **III.** 180, 186, 322.
Waldensians, **I.** 112, 324, 521, **II.** 265, 676, 680.
Wall of partition, **I.** 392, 405, **II.** 96.
Warning given, **II.** 186, 390, **III.** 95, 108, 110, 116, 132, 135, 151, 165.
" lack of, **III.** 119, 197–8, 228.
War, continuing, **III.** 129, 152.
" ended, when, **II.** 770.
" future, **II.** 102, etc., 105, 109, 204, 751, etc., 758, etc., 766, etc., 770, **III.** 161, 165, 391, 576, 591, 598.
" future religious, **II.** 655, 725, etc., 738, etc., 743, 751, etc., 759, 760, 766, 768.
" Psalms, **II.** 768. See Imprecatory Psalms.
Washing of regeneration, **II.** 478.
Watch, implication of, **III.** 94.
Watchfulness, caution too, how violated, **III.** 101, etc., 116, 119, 135–6, 165–6, 168–9, 197–8, 219, 222, 225, 227–8, 258–9.
" enjoined, **III.** 95, 97–9, 106, 108, 119, 132–3, 135, 141, 159, 166–7–8, 180, 236,

258, 299, etc., 308, 322, 384.
Watching, II. 326, 332.
Way, the narrow, III. 186.
" smallness of the, III. 562.
Wealth, III. 132, 152.
" its influence, III. 129, 152.
" of the church, III. 129.
Wedding, III. 301, etc.
Weeks, the seventy, II. 659, etc., 718.
Westminster Assembly, I. 531–2, II. 220, III. 176, 182.
Whitbyan view, I. 373, 525, 528, 530, 532–4, 547–9, II. 150, 153, 155, 163, 215, 216, 217, 220, 265, 284, 378, 772, III. 134, 170, 172–3, 176–7, etc., 179, etc., 181, etc., 197, etc., 199, 215, 236.
White Brethren, II. 567.
" horses, II. 580.
" (Mrs.), the prophetess, II. 323, III. 163, 264–6.
Whore, the, II. 683–4, 756.
Wicked, dead raised, II. 278, 288.
" " " not with saints, II. 273, etc., 275, 278.
" " " not with saints, why delayed, II. 289, 290.
" destiny of, II. 387, 578, 581, 595, 743, 772.
" morning, and the, II. 416.
" removed, III. 185, 189.
" salvability, and, II. 468.
" see the saints honored, 594–5, 740.
Wickedness, future, II. 105, 128, 186, 743, 748, 750, 772. See Antichrist, Signs, Unbelief, etc.
" increased, III. 123, 127, etc., 131, 144, 147, 160, 164–5, 183, 185, 188, 194, 197–8, 293–4, 382, 437. See Unbelief, etc.
Wickliffites, I. 521, II. 676.
Wilderness, the, II. 326, III. 21–23.
Wilhelminians, III. 70.
Wilkinson (Jemima), III. 70.
Will, the Divine, III. 597. See Divine Purpose.
" of God done, the, III. 444, etc.
Willing people, a, III. 591.
Wise understand, the, III. 97, 108, 151.
Wisdom and rulership, II. 580.
" true, III. 441.
" worldly, III. 297.
Witness, Gospel a, III. 117, 137, 141, 169, 192, 197, 200, 204.
" of the Spirit, I. 67.
Witnesses, III. 186, 238–9.
" the two, II. 706, 756.
Woman, creation of the, III. 431, etc.
Word, God jealous of the, I. 337, II. 82.
" of God, extent of, III. 130. See Scripture.
Work, God's accomplished, III. 545.
Works, good, a test, II. 387, 390.
World to come, I. 333, 614, 642, II. 396, 404, 420, 514, 546, 598, III. 587.
" " " Jewish usage, II. 404, etc., 448, etc.
" " " meaning of, II. 406.
" conversion of the. See Conversion, Whitbyan theory, Millennium, etc.
" destruction of by fire, II. 427, 506, 510.
" " " " freezing, II. 428–9.
" dominion, I. 361, 573, 701, II. 23, 33, 44, 97–8, 117, 127, 440, 776. See Kingdom, Reign, Jewish supremacy, Christ, etc.
" end of the, II. 420, etc., 424, 427, etc., 431, etc., 492.
" foundation of the, I. 34, II. 375.
" history of the, III. 427, etc., 588.
" love of the, III. 115.
" old the, meaning of, II. 425.
" perpetuity of the, II. 427, etc., 514. See Earth, etc.
" population of the, III. 201.
Worlds, government of other, III. 443, etc.
" inhabited, III. 443, 445, etc., 562.
" intercommunication of, III. 563.
" plurality of, III. 445, 562.
Worship of Antichrist, III. 161.
" idol, III. 161, 163.
" unbelief, and, II. 727.
Wrath of the Lamb, the, III. 22, 295, 391.
Wrestlers, III. 70.
Writer, Jesus no, I. 271–2, 627.
Writers, Chiliastic, I. 546.
" controversial, I. 547–8.

Year-day fulfilment, II. 686, 717, 755–6, III. 133, 374.
" of Jubilee, II. 453, III. 182.
" " the Redeemed, II. 768.
" Sabbatical, the, II. 452, III. 90.
" of Release, III. 99.
Years, one thousand, the, II. 409, 456, 504, 528, 631, 638.
" one hundred and forty-four thousand, II. 322, 331, 380, III. 126, 160, 163, 263, 266, 375.
" prophetical, III. 99.
Young (Brigham), I. 618.

Zeal, mistaken, I. 13. See Heresy-hunting.
Zebedee's children, I. 464, 585.
Zion, II. 52, 72.
" Mt., no type, III. 32, 37, 51.
" " an inheritance (Christ's), III. 49, 50.
Zionites, III. 51.
Zoharites, I. 54.

Denver Seminary Library
Washington DC Extension
1st Bapt Church Glenarden
3600 Brightseat Road
Landover, MD 20785-2414